REFLECTIVE PERSPECTIVES: NEGOTIATIONS AT AND WITHIN THE BORDERS OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCE

A post-qualitative inquiry of cultural hybridity within third space enunciations

Megan Ann Wood

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education (Research)

Centre for Learning Innovation
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
December, 2015

Keywords

border crossing pedagogy, Indigenous, non-Indigenous, collaboration, difference, intercultural, negotiation, post-qualitative, third space, cultural hybridity

Acronyms

NEAF: National Ethics Application Form

Abstract

This research has sought to explore the in-between space of intercultural collaboration between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia. The overarching aim of this research is to explore the negotiations of cultural difference through articulated moments of intercultural collaboration and interaction in an attempt to support a deeper understanding and awareness of the pedagogical practice of collaboration between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia. A post-qualitative inquiry has guided me in my engagement with two publicly available reflective outputs (as 'data' for analysis), multiple theories, literature, stories and personal experiences to dwell at the borders of cultural difference. I also acknowledge throughout this research project that ideology, imbued through discourse, has the power to enforce or challenge cultural and social domination. This in turn creates cultural hegemony, a process whereby a particular social and cultural group has the power to influence the thoughts, expectations and behaviours of the rest of society. As I consider the concept of negotiations in moments of intercultural collaboration and notions of reconciliatory projects and solidarity, it is important that I maintain critical awareness of ideological presence in discourse and its influential authority over people. The interstitial location of intercultural collaboration—the meeting place of different and legitimate knowledge systems—is the core focus of this research project.

Table of Contents

Statement of Original Authorship

The work contained in this thesis has not been previously submitted to meet requirements for an award at this or any other higher education institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made.

Signature: QUT Verified Signature

Date: 8/12/2015

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the support of my supervisors Dr Linda Knight (principal supervisor) and Associate Professor Beryl Exley (associate supervisor)—thank you both for your time, trust, patience, professional guidance and many long distant Skype sessions from various locations around the Northern Territory. Special thanks to Seraphina Presley (mentor and colleague) who provided substantial time deliberating the initial stages of this research project. I would also like to acknowledge and thank Associate Professor Felicity McArdle, Sarah Romig and Eliette Webb, who have all played a significant role in the development of this research project.

Thank you to my family, friends, colleagues and students who inspire me with their walk of life and who have supported and encouraged the development of this research project in some way. A huge thanks to my parents for their ongoing love and support and to friends Lincoln and Bec. Special thanks goes to Susan Ngwarrey Moore (mentor, colleague and friend) who has relentlessly stood by me professionally and personally from the beginning stages. Much love and so many thanks to Bill. You're my favourite.

Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem

1.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This research has sought to explore the in-between space (Bhahba, 1994) of intercultural partnerships between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia. The overarching aim of this research is to explore the negotiations of cultural difference through articulated moments of intercultural collaboration and interaction. A post-qualitative inquiry has guided me in my engagement with two publicly available reflective outputs (as 'data' for analysis), as well as multiple theories, literature, stories and personal experiences to dwell at the borders of cultural difference. 'Intercultural' emphasises understanding the interactions between different cultural groups, as opposed to exclusively valuing one particular group over another (Phipps & Guilherme, 2004) and 'partnership' is the collaboration between people working together with shared visions to solve common issues or create a united idea (Lowe, 2013). This project is concerned with the negotiated interactions within processes of intercultural collaboration between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia. In particular how this research can contribute to the ongoing dialogue that assists in improving collaborative endeavours in intercultural realms in Australia. Throughout this dissertation I have used the term Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples when referring to the traditional owners and original inhabitants of the Australian continent and surrounding islands. When referring to Indigenous peoples globally, I use the term 'Indigenous'.

Anthropologist and linguist Peter Sutton (2009) explains his idea of intercultural partnerships and the processes of collaboration, as the instance of scholars seeking to work in societies that are culturally, linguistically and socially different from an individual's own. His notion of 'unusual couples' is grounded in the art of negotiating a relationship where people learn to relate to another person in order to "enter into another, very different kind of society" (2009, p. 163). He acknowledges the complexities and the emotional intensity of negotiating such partnerships and the impact on all individuals over time. 'Unusual', as historically it has been unusual for

"two people to commit themselves in such a demanding way to the creation of knowledge and understanding across what has often been a vast cultural divide" (p. 189). In Australia, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and their communities are linked to a history grounded in dispossession, assimilation and racial and constitutional discrimination. Whereas it is not uncommon for non-Indigenous people who identify with Western culture to be grounded in ideological beliefs and social and cultural systems that are engrained in dominant Western authority. There are generations of non-Indigenous Australians with an educational naivety in relation to the colonial and imperialistic history of this nation. This naivety contributes to an increase in subconscious ignorance of the "protective and repressive legislation and of the ideology and practice of white racism" (Reynolds, 1999, p. 4). These elements of ideological positioning often infiltrates through to intercultural working relationships, subsequently creating 'partnerships and 'collaborative' endeavours that are bound by cultural and ideological divides. This research is concerned with how to contribute to the support and strengthening of intercultural partnerships through the exploration of collaborative processes.

Sutton (2009) powerfully denotes that when establishing personal connections with key informants in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, "proper attitudes, listening, being nice and cultural relativism are not enough. One has to change" (2009, p. 163). 'Change' comes through critically attending to one's own consciousness and developing a raised awareness of inequality in race-related society and the power of Indigenous ways of knowing and being (Grande, 2013). Without denying the damage of Western research paradigms and methods on Indigenous knowledge systems or rebuking the decolonising seminal works of people such as Nakata (2009), Kovach (2009) and Smith (1999) who will be introduced throughout this research project, Peter Sutton (2009) flips the scrutiny of the us/them representations within the academic field, by paying 'tribute' to intercultural collaborative research partnerships over time. He speaks of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships at the grassroots level and discusses how intellectual partnerships have contributed "to the rich fabric of understanding and appreciation of Australia's cultures" (p. 193). He asserts that the relationship between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples, where cultural differences are ever present, is the kind of reconciliation that 'matters most'.

In pursuit of identifying educational practice that is reconciliatory, Worby, Irabinna Rigney and Ulalka Tur (2011) affirm that celebrating and promoting successful intercultural partnerships is one way to merge the disconnection between practice and theorisations that simply 'explain' processes of intercultural collaboration. However, they also concede that to simply acknowledge and celebrate achievements and focus primarily on the positive outcomes, "we would risk tokenism" (p. 221). Within pedagogical discourse that 'teaches' about intercultural interactions and communication or celebrates intercultural collaborative endeavours there is often a void in acknowledgement and exploration of the differences that exist between intercultural collaborators, creating an unspoken or 'silenced dialogue' that many, including myself, deem of critical importance (Worby, Irabinna Rigeny & Ulalka Tur, 2011).

This research project is also concerned with ensuring the collaborative efforts of non-Indigenous peoples do not deny Indigenous people their knowledge, skills, beliefs and practices by dominating the 'learning space' and creating projects based on the ideals of Western knowledge and ideology. Ideology has been described as "the problem of social relations of domination made intelligible through discourse" (Leonardo & Allen, 2008, p. 416). Ideology, imbued through discourse, has the power to enforce or challenge cultural and social domination, which in turn creates cultural hegemony, a process whereby a particular social and cultural group has the power to influence the thoughts, expectations and behaviours of the rest of society. As I consider the concept of intercultural partnerships and notions of reconciliation and solidarity, it is important that I maintain critical awareness of ideological presence in discourse and its influential authority over people. In Section 1.2 I acknowledge the vexed and contested history and contexts in Australia regarding the relationship between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples. In Section 1.3 I formally introduce myself and my subjective position in the frame of this research. Section 1.4 introduces the reflective outputs used for the purpose of data analysis and Section 1.5 introduces the key concepts and terms that collectively create the design of this research project.

1.2 BACKGROUND

The Australian Government website defines reconciliation as the "unity and respect between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and non-Indigenous Australians. It is about respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage and valuing justice and equity for all Australians" (2013, para.1). Prior to investigating the processes of 'making a treaty' and formalizing the notion of reconciliation in Australia, it is crucial to confront the "legacy of the past and re-align the relationship between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and government and the people of Australia" (Dodson, 2003, p. 31). Kevin Lowe (2011), a *Gubi Gubi* man from South-east Queensland and current Inspector of Aboriginal Education for the New South Wales Board of Studies, explains that within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in Australia, empowerment grows from an enduring place where power and potential already exists. Mansell (2003), Gammage (2011), and Rigney (2003) concur by providing profound insight into the political, educational, social and economic systems that were established and self-governed well before the colonial disruption. Before white invasion, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples "were the sole and undisputed sovereign authorities" (Mansell, p. 15). Mansell (2003) continues to explain that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's autonomy and self-governance was not destroyed as a result of invasion, but oppressed by the colonizing forces of white power which "prevented the continuing exercise of sovereign authority by Aboriginal people" (p. 15).

In Australia the cultural assumptions and behaviours of non-Indigenous people often reinforce and exemplify the elements and attributes exposed in whiteness theorisations. Whiteness theory studies race and the cultural constructions, values and beliefs of a dominant society and exposes the ideologies and consequential privileges of dominant societies. Social relationships are determined, categorised and influenced by race and different levels of unequal power are created (Jensen, 2010). Acts of 'whiteness', whereby behaviours result in outcomes that benefit people who identify largely with the dominant society, is common practice that controls institutions within Australia and is ruled by Western culture (Jensen, 2010). Australia is a colonised nation. Without personal knowledge and recognition of the ruthless history of this Land's colonised past and the reality that many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

peoples continue to experience its harmful effects, we risk remaining ignorant; ignorant of the intricate structures of Indigenous epistemologies and above all else, complicit with modern day acts of imperialism that continue to emphasise superior ideals from the perspective of the Western world. Although governmental policies and initiatives have powerful influence over the mindset of many people in Australia and are active contributors to the reinforcement of cultural hegemony, it is a common misconception that processes of reconciliation are the sole responsibility of governments. A top-down approach of government-driven 'gestures' of reconciliation—that often "avoid the real issues" (Freeman, p. 215, 2014) of challenging the ideology that blindly believes that colonialism is a thing of the past—is only one of the many paradigms in which reconciliation can become a sovereign reality. Worby Et al. (2011) include a snapshot of Patrick Dodson's speech from the 2000 Lingiari Lecture in their article "Where Salt and Fresh Waters Meet: Reconciliation and Change in Education". He asserts that the quality of reconciliation in Australia will depend on an ability to embrace all its aspects over four levels:

> There is the personal level. This is the level of human encounter… then there is the reconciliation at the social level. These are the social policy matters that have to do with health, housing, education, employment, welfare and an economic base… then there is the reconciliation of governance. This is about governments making laws that remove rights, or enhance them… Finally there is the reconciliation of recognition. The sovereign position that Aboriginal peoples assert has never been ceded… to have any substantial reconciliation we must encompass all these aspects, no matter how challenging that may seem. (2011, p. 205-206)

The questions, goals and visions of reconciliation in their entirety are complex and highly contested by researchers who dedicate their work to this territory e.g. Martin Nakata (2007), Marie Battiste (2000), Rick Wallace (2010), Victoria Freeman (2010), Lester-Irabinna Rigney (2003). To address all these aspects is beyond the scope of this inquiry. This dissertation is concerned with the 'personal level' of reconciliation: the level of human encounter—the processes of negotiating ways of working together in 'unity' and 'respect' (Worby Et al. 2011). What I have addressed here with regard to reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples provides important,

interconnected relevance to this research and has influenced the way examples of collaboration between intercultural partnerships and community based projects at grass roots level have been interpreted and critiqued.

Victoria Freeman (2014) concedes that reasons for reconciliation failures in Australia is because too often formalised 'processes' and discourse attempts to obliterate differences between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples. Reconciliation, solidarity and respectful partnerships cannot be about obliterating difference. Rather than remaining masked behind ideological frameworks or endless attempts at trying to 'change' and assimilate people, differences need to be negotiated, acknowledged and respectfully embraced. Freeman (2014) states that for Indigenous peoples, anti-colonial alliances are one way to "help break down the social divide between 'us' and 'them'" (p. 220).

This research will focus on the reflections and stories of intercultural collaboration from the perspective of non-Indigenous people working in intercultural contexts and consider how processes of negotiation can be revealed. When people take time to critically consider the differences between social and cultural beings, there is a deepened insight that challenges the mindset and potentially supports non-Indigenous people in the 'social level' of reconciliation. I acknowledge that often the focus of reconciliation is how to 'support' and strengthen the understanding of non-Indigenous peoples. I also acknowledge that this heightened understanding has potential to further contribute to the social dominance of non-Indigenous peoples. However, I maintain concern for and focus on situations where non-Indigenous peoples unfortunately dominate—an increased awareness of the underlying power dynamics in sites of intercultural collaboration has potential to support critical reflection and reconsideration of actions.

I also maintain awareness of the harmful effects of Western knowledge and imposed perspectives in discourses that attempt to conceptualise or interpret the knowledge of Indigenous peoples around the world. To prevent further contributions of 'white power' and colonial conceptualizations of an epistemology I will only ever know and respect as an outsider, I attempt to maintain critical reflexivity of my subjective positioning as a non-Indigenous person throughout this thesis. This is an honest effort

to explore the notion of transforming and strengthening reciprocal relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and move beyond a paradigm of power and control to negotiate respectful and reflective partnerships, working together, in a culture-sharing context.

1.3 RELATEDNESS

Karen Lillian Martin (2008) discusses the importance of relatedness for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and their Country. Martin (2008) addresses the foundation of relatedness as grounded "on the ontological premise" (p. 71) of the multiplicity of Entities in the world (human, non-human) and the relatedness between them. She states that "how you come to know about your world" (p. 71) can be dependent on an awareness and openness to acknowledge how you are positioned in different relationships. Although I maintain awareness of my own cultural hybridity, I have engaged with the three knowledge bands "Ways of Knowing, Ways of Being and Ways of Doing" (p. 72) which guide and keep me grounded in my awareness of relatedness with different people and places. With the rise of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples working collaboratively together on shared visions and endeavours, Martin (2008) asserts, "this relatedness remains core" (p. 76). Although this brief explanation does not thoroughly conceptualise or pay justice to Martin's (2008) extensive exploration and documentation of this concept, it is important to acknowledge who I am, where I come from and why I am 'doing' research in the space of intercultural relations. This research project is inspired and motivated by the will to explore ways in which culturally, linguistically and socially different educators, working within an intercultural school setting context successfully work together as team teachers. In the following section I introduce myself.

My name is Megan Wood. I am 31 years old and identify as a non-Indigenous white Australian. I'm from a small town called Little River in Victoria. Little River is located on *Wautharong* Country, traditional land of the *Wautharong* people. My parents still live there in the white double story house I grew up in. I have two brothers. I constructed the majority of this thesis when living in Alice Springs. Alice Springs has been placed upon the traditional land and sacred sites of the *Arrernte* peoples and is often referred to by its traditional name—*Mparntwe*. I am a passionate educator,

determined and inspired by my colleagues, students, community and the local, national and global affairs that inform and influence the societies we live in. Student growth, development and achievement and success are vitally important, as is access to an authentic and relevant education that provides pathways of opportunity and possibility. When first moving to an Aboriginal community 400kms North East of Alice Springs, it didn't take long to realise that I was about to begin a professional and personal journey that was different to anything I had ever experienced. Four years of primary teaching in inner city Melbourne (Australia's second largest city) didn't seem to count for much as I started my roles and responsibilities as 'teacher' in my year 3/4 class at the community school. Soon after experiencing the initial myriad of challenges one faces when first moving to work and live in a culturally and linguistically diverse location (which in hindsight are quite superficial: no mobile phone reception, extreme weather, red sand everywhere, in the 'middle of nowhere') it became quite clear that I had bigger challenges I needed to address. I was working at an interface of cultural knowledge bound by relationships that pertained to a very complex history that continued to govern the school community.

There were too many unacceptable processes and deficit attitudes—ways of being that made me feel uncomfortable, frustrated and determined to challenge and change the way 'I' had initially established 'my' classroom. I needed to relinquish my power as classroom teacher and turn to the experts. There were eight Aboriginal educators working as Assistant Teachers in each of the classrooms. These women were the continuity for the students, experts in their Indigenous knowledge and ways of learning and they were extremely grounded in their visions for education—now and the future. Once acknowledging this, I was able to see that I was living and working in someone's centre of everywhere. It was vital that I engaged in dialogue to find common ground in our culture-sharing context in order for us to build authentic professional partnerships. To be a progressive and successful teacher in an Indigenous community, educating with and for people who were culturally and linguistically different from me, I needed to first reflect on my own culture and relearn my theories of action in education.

In most Aboriginal community schools in the Northern Territory, Aboriginal and non-Indigenous educators work together in the classroom as team teachers. Strong

relationships aide in creating a respectful space where culturally and linguistically diverse educators can establish mutual respect for diverse knowledge and develop equal partnerships as well as developing a collaborative understanding of a two-way, culturally responsive education for their students. However, there are many subjective positionings and elements that deem these partnerships 'unusual' (Sutton, 2009). This includes the difference of language, ways of communicating, conceptualisations of family, home, Country, education, ways of learning, our positioning in the wider national society, our positioning within the boundaries of the community and many other cultural and social elements of which I would not even be aware. Furthermore, although an invaluable partnership, it is one that is often marred with the inequalities. This method of pedagogical practice, if embraced, understood and valued with mutual understandings, provides educators who are culturally and linguistically different from each other an opportunity to enter into a partnership that embraces the conceptualization of Peter Sutton's (2009) 'unusual couples'.

I have learnt and believe that building strong reciprocal partnerships (through collaborative endeavours) with Indigenous teachers and assistant teachers and being united in visions for education now and the future, contributes to improved workplace morale, profound professional learning, friendship and ultimately assists in providing high quality, culturally responsive teaching and learning experiences for students. I have also learnt that it is not easy. I am constantly mindful of and challenged and inspired by the differences between Western and Indigenous knowledge systems. It is a complex space, one that keeps me reflecting, learning and renegotiating best practice.

The initial design of this research project sought to explore the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Indigenous educators working together as 'team teachers'. Professional attitudes, values and visions for education from a diverse range of perspectives within a cultural sharing-context were to be documented and analysed using a critical qualitative research design and focus group methodology. The core intention was to analyse and compare different responses in order to conceptualise the current depth of understanding and practice of team teaching at a remote Northern Territory school, located in an Aboriginal community. This design intended to explore the ways different intercultural teaching teams negotiated their working relationship with a specific focus on cultural and linguistic difference. This design also intended to

listen to and use the voice, perspective and story of both Aboriginal and non-Indigenous peoples. This design was presented, considered and subsequently passed at my university confirmation seminar milestone. I then proceeded to complete the National Ethics Application Form (NEAF) required and necessary for people wanting to conduct research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Many elements needed to be considered when completing the NEAF, such as: the sensitive nature of the inquiry, my positioning as a non-Indigenous white woman wanting to conduct 'research' in an Indigenous context (and the many complexities that pertain), ensuring that my purpose and intent held relevance and importance for the school and wider community and that the thesis in its final form did not carry negative consequences for participants (therefore privacy and anonymity needed to be highly considered). After receiving extensive feedback on a NEAF draft and making relevant amendments, I submitted my application to the ethics committee. The application was not accepted, however, feedback was provided. Due to time restraints, reworking the design of the project at this stage of my Masters Dissertation process (with the intention of resubmitting a NEAF) was not achievable and it was suggested I use publicly available data. Therefore due to the sensitive nature of the topic and the extensive scope needed to ensure ethical standards were both met and maintained, I was unable to contextualise the 'data' to the specific context of a school setting and team teacher participants within the timeframe allocated for completing a Masters dissertation. This is the core reason my research project is not contextualised to a specific professional partnership within an Education department and why it does not include the story and perspective of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Although this was a limitation of the project, the evolved design enabled me to challenge my understandings of a linear research process and increase my awareness of the contested space of intercultural working partnership bound by the effects of a colonial history. As a result of this process I decided to use publicly available reflections on intercultural collaboration from the perspective of non-Indigenous peoples only.

The core focus of this research is on the negotiations of cultural difference within articulated moments of intercultural collaboration and interaction. I use two publicly available documents that explicate the intercultural experiences from the perspective of non-Indigenous peoples working on collaborative endeavours with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to consider the critical elements of the theories I have

embraced. Although these documents (used as 'data') do not sit within the educational realm of school systems, the professional vocation and collaborative endeavour is not the core focus of this research project—I maintain the focus on the stories and reflections that address how people have perceived their working relationships and collaborative endeavours. I use the documents to assist me in exploring how reflective outputs that explicate moments of intercultural collaboration and interaction can assist in supporting a deeper understanding and awareness of the pedagogical practice of intercultural collaboration. I use the following overarching question to guide my research project:

- What processes of intercultural interaction and collaboration are evident in reflective outputs and how can they be used to inform and strengthen the way people work together in intercultural contexts?

I use the term 'reflective output' to signify an artefact that reflects an experience or promotes a subjective understanding of intercultural collaboration and negotiation. Section 1.4 introduces the reflective outputs used as 'data' for the analysis of this research project. Both outputs will be explained in more detail in Research Methods, Section 4.3.

1.4 THE REFLECTIVE OUTPUTS (AS 'DATA')

The first reflective output is a personal reflection by Dutch Australian film director Rolf De Heer (2007) (see Appendix A). De Heer (2007) published a reflective narrative titled "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects" in the 42nd edition of the *Australian Humanities Review*. Based on what he nominates as "instinctive and unconscious" (2007, para.2) ways of being, he takes his audience on a short journey that describes his experiences as a film director concerned with the creation of films that tell Indigenous stories and contain Indigenous themes. Throughout the reflective output De Heer (2007) reflects on three separate films he has worked on with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia: an unmade project titled *The Other Side of the Frontier, The Tracker* and *Ten Canoes.*

The second reflective output is a transcript of an interview between musician Michael Hohnen and journalist Patrick Pittman (2011), titled "Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators" (see Appendix B)—both men are non-Indigenous Australians. The interview was published in *Dumbo Feather*—a magazine that claims to document dialogue with 'extraordinary people'. Hohnen (2011) reflects on his experiences in the interview with Pittman on his collaborative relationship with Geoffrey Gurrumul Yunupingu, a hailed musician from Galiwinku (Elcho Island), North East Arnhem Land.

While the focus of this research is not on the collaborative projects produced as a result of intercultural collaboration (and rather maintains focus on the processes of collaboration) it is important to acknowledge that both men are inextricably linked to nationally and internationally acclaimed projects. As publicly available outputs were used as 'data' (therefore not self-generated and impersonal) initially I felt it important to choose people who were well represented in the media to assist in gaining greater insight into the individual people and the nature of their intercultural relationships. The reflections of Rolf De Heer (2007) and Michael Hohnen (2011) describe their respective experiences working collaboratively with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples over the past 10—20 years. Although the locational contexts and professional realms are similar, the two men have different and unique ways of reflecting on their intercultural collaborations. It is important to state that I only engage with the stories and reflections of non-Indigenous peoples for the purpose of analysis, therefore the focus on negotiation (given my own subjectivities as a non-Indigenous woman and the subjective stories of two non-Indigenous men) is centered on "negotiating the complex terrain of anti-colonial enquiry" (Phillips, 2005, p. 1) from the reflective perspective of non-Indigenous peoples.

Intercultural partnerships grounded in collaborative practice in the arts have been chosen for this post-qualitative analysis. Arts based projects and reflective outputs are often at the heart of stories that celebrate, commemorate and powerfully denote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander history, jurisdiction, language, culture and success. The creation of art in all its forms is an influential component in raising an awareness of social and cultural diversity and bringing people together. For many artists the objective intentions of their work, even in the physical creation and

exhibition of solo art forms, often symbolize the creative efforts and inspiration of key collaborators (John-Steiner, 2011). It is important to reiterate, however, that partnerships grounded in arts based collaboration are *not* the focus of this inquiry. Instead the primary foci are the moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. I have engaged with two separate reflective outputs for the purpose of exploring the collaboration between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE, SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS

The importance of building reconciliatory partnerships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples at the social level of human encounter is a widely researched topic. Much literature denotes with conviction that 'working together' in intercultural partnerships is an essential characteristic in intercultural realms. Often, the processes that trouble the space of intercultural encounters and collaboration—the challenges, the temporal moments and negotiations of difference—are missing elements. Furthermore, there is limited research that engages a strong correlation between the ontology and epistemology of theory and that of methodology. Too often this space is theorised in the "post", but neatly placed within the codes and categories of totalising methodological practice (St. Pierre, 2011). Epistemology and ontology are concepts I refer to throughout this thesis. I refer to epistemology as what is considered knowledge and how people "come to know what they know" (Arensen, 2009, p. 349). Epistemology is thought of as "proper knowledge of something" (Arensen, 2009, p. 349) giving cause and reason to certain phenomena. I understand ontology as a way of being. Ontology is subjective and depends on an individual's perspective. Ontological perspectives give different thought and ways of understanding social phenomena (Arensen, 2009).

As well as exploring the complex, dynamic, ever changing and evolving space of the intercultural, I have spent much time carefully considering the research design, theoretical framework and methodological underpinnings of this dissertation. The theoretical grounding for this research has been constructed within a critical theory paradigm and explored with a postcolonial lens. I will use elements of these theories to think about and investigate the intercultural encounters. Critical border crossing

pedagogy provides a theoretical framework that underpins conceptualizations of dominant social groups developing a greater understanding of their own positioning within a different cultural space, especially with regard to their relationship with people from marginalised groups (Giroux, 2005). I have engaged with the theoretical convictions of Henry Giroux, a white American theorist, (2005) as I explore negotiations of difference at and within cultural borders. Giroux's (2005) critical theories of border crossing pedagogy provide me with a deepened awareness of the politics and power imbued in social movements as well as political approaches to language and intercultural communication. Postcolonial theory addresses the effect of colonization on culture as it challenges people to acknowledge the hierarchical and imperial legacies of colonialism (Kaplan, 2013) and in particular, how colonial power takes form and perpetuates inequality in Western discourse (Kaplan, 2013). Postcolonial theory challenges the cultural perceptions infused and constructed within 'conventional humanistic' research and literature, and inspires alternative ways to explore, read and respond to this discourse. I have engaged with postcolonial theory as I explore and deepen my awareness of the cultural bindings of intercultural encounters and collaboration. For the purpose of this research, postcolonial theory and its ontology provide me with a way of engaging with the social imagery of the reflective outputs. Furthermore, this theory has challenged me to critically consider the way I have documented my learning and deepened understandings. Although critical theories place emphasis on 'meaning making' for the purpose of emancipation and empowerment, Giroux (2005) concedes that an entanglement of postcolonial theory and pedagogies of border crossings are important in order to challenge the humanistic tendencies found in critical theory conceptualisations.

The intercultural space is marred by the colonial legacy of Western researchers who have attempted to represent the cultural orientation of Indigenous peoples through "different conceptualisations of things such as time, space and subjectivity, different and competing theories of knowledge, highly specialised forms of language and structures of power" (Smith, 1999, p. 45). I have approached this research with an active awareness of how Western philosophies have historically embraced and promoted empirical representations of societies. Smith (1999) concedes that 'research,' as a way to deepen one's conceptual understanding of the social world, has been misunderstood as a means to measure and develop "operational definitions of

phenomena which are reliable and valid" (p. 44). Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre (2013) refers to this as conventional humanist qualitative inquiry, an ontology "that assumes there is a given out there" (p. 224). She asserts that some qualitative methodologies continue to ignore the incommensurability of complex symbols and subjectivities of society through adamantly re-representing "words in those texts" as brute, sense data (p. 224). The characteristics of humanist inquiries promote empirical representations bound up in binary oppositions that attempt to enforce standard ways of being "coded in the Western system of knowledge" (Smith, 1999, p. 45). These representations (that continue to pervade the ontological way of modern society) tend to classify and categorise peoples and knowledge reinforcing colonial hierarchies. McConaghy (2000) explores this concept:

> Binary oppositions are manifestations of the use of comparative methods within a totalising schema. Such comparisons ensure that incommensurable phenomena are presented in oppositional, rather than heterogenic terms. It is not enough to recognise that diverse phenomena exist. They must be compared and contrasted within a Universalist framework. (p. 91)

Giroux (2005) describes that the unfortunate 'fatal attraction' of the binary opposition has been a way to "maintain control over the Other through categories of discourse developed in repressive totalities and exclusion" (p. 15). He continues to inform that these totalities are not only the representative of neoconservatives, but a common manifestation in the research of "many critical cultural workers and educators" (p. 15).

Elements of postcolonial theory and border pedagogy have guided me in critical readings and interpretations of Western literature. Furthermore, in my attempt to muse the interactions that emerge in the temporal moments of intercultural collaboration I maintain active awareness of how 'representations' in discourse have the superior ability to "name, marginalise, and define difference as the devalued other" (Giroux, 2005, p. 25). Not including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander voice and perspective is a limitation of this research project and could be considered a contradiction especially given that I am using postcolonial theory. However, I am using the subjective reflections of two non-Indigenous people to explore how non-Indigenous stories and experiences of intercultural collaboration can be promoted in a postcolonial

and critical pedagogical way. I consider how non-Indigenous peoples' stories and experiences can be used to elicit critical conversations about the ideological power imbalance in societies, in particular, contexts where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples are working together.

I have engaged with the postcolonial theories of Homi K Bhabha and drawn on analytical concepts from his text *The Location of Culture* (1994). Cultural hybridity, the emergent and performative act of cultural translation, is a term used by Bhabha (1994) that explores processes of negotiation and accommodation at and within cultural boundaries. Cultural boundaries refer to the borderline between culturally different people and societies—cultural hybrids living in hybrid societies. Documented moments of cultural hybridity enable a social imagery of the way subjects (in their multiplicity) entangle in moments of cultural translation. Bhabha (1994) refers to this as the 'third space of enunciation'—the "inscription and articulation of cultures hybridity" (p. 56), the "indeterminate space of the subjects" (p. 55). An enunciation "ensures that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity" (p. 55). I have selected segments from the reflective outputs that capture moments of cultural hybridity—moments where multiple and undefinable subjectivities move together—and named them 'enunciations'. A hybrid reading and critique of the enunciations enabled me to see the emergence of difference that arises in moments of intercultural encounter and collaboration. In my analysis (and bound by my own subjective positioning), I generate my own 'enunciations of cultural hybridity'.

The reflective outputs reflect the experiences and progressive practice over time of two separate intercultural collaborative endeavours. The reflective outputs have been read, interpreted and analysed using elements of border crossing (as pedagogical practice) and enunciations of cultural hybridity (how the encounter is articulated to reveal the cultural bindings of the interactions) in the third space (the location of the intercultural encounter). I read the reflective outputs in their entirety and selected specific segments that reflect moments of intercultural encounter/collaboration. I have called these segments 'enunciations'. The enunciations provide different moments of intercultural interaction. They enable me to see and acknowledge how differences that emerge at the site of intercultural encounter are negotiated in an individual's attempt to work on a united and shared vision.

The ontological and epistemological groundings of post-qualitative inquiry do not allow for "conventionalist humanist qualitative inquiry" (St. Pierre, 2011, p. 611). The analytical processes of post-qualitative inquiry rely on a theoretical reading and analysis of the reflective outputs. I utilise a methodology that guides me to maintain focus on the entanglement of the temporal subjectivities in moments of intercultural encounter and collaboration. A post-qualitative inquiry approach has guided me to reveal and deliberate the negotiations and accommodations of difference at and within the borders of cultural difference from the perspective of non-Indigenous peoples. I attempt to avoid applying fixed or assumed meanings based on context, cultural identity or offering an interpreted meaning of what people did or thought. I have worked within the boundaries of what is articulated in each temporal and emergent enunciation. I do not assume or insinuate greater meaning based on my inferences and subjectivities. I have not re-represented the stories as findings or representations of *how* to collaborate within an intercultural space. The reflective outputs are not my stories. They are a snapshot from two people's reflective perspective of a single moment in time. I use the reflective outputs of Rolf De Heer (2007) and Michael Hohnen and Patrick Pittman (2011) to see how reflections can create social imagery (Bhabha, 1994) and reveal moments of cultural hybridity—the negotiation of how people work while accommodating the differences that exist in the in-between location of intercultural encounter and collaboration. In this exploration of the reflective outputs, I investigate how they provide a way to inform and strengthen the working relationships between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-indigenous peoples in Australia.

1.6 THESIS OUTLINE

Chapter Two reviews literature that has informed and inspired the construction of this research project. I draw on literature that honours and reflects the voice of Indigenous scholars and educators who guide my thinking and work in this area. A core focus of the Literature Review draws on research that troubles the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples within the bounds of professional grounding. I also address current literature that embraces post-qualitative methodologies. Chapter Three provides the Theoretical Framework for this research project. I develop my

articulations of the theories I have used in particular post-colonial theories of Homi K. Bhabha (1994) and border crossing pedagogy (Giroux, 2005). Chapter Four provides a detailed interpretation of post-qualitative inquiry and how my methodology correlates with the ontology of the chosen theories. This section provides detailed explanation of the research methods. Chapter Five is the analysis of the two separate reflective outputs, Rolf De Heer's (2007) "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects" and Patirck Pittman's (2011) interview with Michael Hohnen, titled *"*Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators". Chapter Six is the final discussion for this research project.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This inquiry is concerned with the in-between space of intercultural encounters and collaboration. 'Intercultural' presents a site of difference—language, culture, learning and the relationship between the differences all bound with unique, evolving and often unbeknown or 'hidden' codes. 'Interculturality', the movement and interaction between different languages and cultures, provides opportunity to experience and consider the differences that emerge in moments of intercultural interaction (Phipps & Guilherme, 2004). A heightened awareness and active acknowledgement of the differences that emerge in sites of intercultural interaction and collaboration enables a dialogue that explores the relationship between them. I acknowledge the fluidity and un-fixed conceptualization of 'culture'; therefore it is not within my jurisdiction to establish or solidify notions of cultural differences based on the reflective outputs I introduced (as 'data' for this research project) in Chapter One. I have used post-qualitative inquiry as I think with theory in attempt to "create ontological becomings" (Youngblood Jackson, 2013, p. 741) that displaces the 'human' as the core of the inquiry (Youngblood Jackson, 2013) and in 'control' in moments of intercultural collaboration. Bhabha's (1994) postcolonial third space theory and Giroux's (1995) border crossing pedagogy form the theoretical basis for exploring interactions at and within cultural borders. Furthermore, I approach this space with awareness of the inextricable links between the productions of knowledge, language and power and the implications for people objectified in discourse from the perspective of dominant Western philosophical worldview. As well as exploring intercultural negotiation in moments of collaboration, I am also concerned with the construction of discourses—the write up and 'retelling' of learning within this complex and ever changing space. This chapter reviews literature that enriches my knowledge and influences and inspires continued wonderings of the intercultural space.

Section 2.2 addresses the contested and complex 'location' where intercultural interaction and collaborations take place, through an exploration of Indigenous knowledges and the colonizing forces of Western academia and other discourses that

have had subsequent detrimental effects. This section draws on literature that explicates the groundings of Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies that subsequently inform border crossing pedagogy. Section 2.3 enters discussions of collaboration and literature that critiques the practical processes of intercultural interactions. This section moves beyond boundaries of cultural difference and engages with literature that confronts the challenges of working in collaborative intercultural partnerships grounded in practical experiences of cultural exchange and translation. This literature acknowledges the contested space and contends with the questions that explore their own methodological practice. Section 2.3 shifts focus from separate knowledge systems to the processes of collaborative endeavors. This section enters a site of negotiation and engages with discourses that challenge, critique and grapple with complexities that exist (in their many facets) within intercultural relations, before they divulge into their 'modus operandi'—how they move, have moved and continue to muse the move, at and within borders of cultural difference. This section is informed by literature that not only promotes the importance of collaboration in intercultural projects but also explores and critically considers the pedagogical processes of intercultural collaboration. The final section, 2.4, addresses literature grounded in the 'ontological turn' of post-qualitative research. The literature in this chapter has supported and influenced my ongoing learning about processes of intercultural collaboration as well as how I subjectively document my learning as written discourse.

2.2 THE CONSTRUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE

Western epistemologies have made substantial contributions to the good of humanity and encompass a rich diversity that can be critiqued in alternative ways. However, for the purpose of this inquiry, the primary focus and critique of Western knowledge is of the dominant, humanistic worldview that characterises a system of 'Eurocentrism'. Eurocentrism has been defined as "a system characterised by intellectual privilege and epistemic narcissism" which has "played a central role in the colonisation of peoples globally" (Styres, Zinga, Bennett, & Bomberry, 2010, p. 618). In a critique of the implications of Western knowledge on Indigenous knowledge and decolonisation, Akena Adyanga (2012) acknowledges that Western knowledge "is a hybrid of different knowledge, adopted through European global expansion, to enrich our learning in formal educational settings" (p. 599). He also asserts, however, that

"knowledge producers, politics, class affiliation and group identity symbiotically influence each other in a complex manner, creating a hybrid knowledge that is a product of such interaction" (Adyanga Akena, 2012, p. 600). The differences that emerge in moments of intercultural interaction are subjectively entangled and subsequently contribute to the performative act of interaction and collaboration. 'Hybrid knowledge' that emerges as a 'product' of intercultural interaction "remains a controversial issue within the study of Western knowledge, Indigenous knowledges and decolonisation" (Adyanga Akena, 2012, p. 600). For this reason intercultural interactions as well as the subsequent formalisation of the learning is the core focus of this research. This section will address the conceptualisations of Indigenous epistemological and ontological paradigms from the philosophical worldview of Indigenous peoples. I begin by acknowledging the impact of Western knowledge systems and the subsequent effect on the humanity of Indigenous peoples and their knowledge.

2.2.1 Destruction of Misrepresentation

Battiste and Youngblood Henderson's (2009) inquiry "Naturalising Indigenous Knowledge in Eurocentric Education" inform me "European knowledge has been constructed as the opposite of Indigenous Knowledge" (p. 6). The challenge for many Indigenous peoples has been the enduring experience of systemic marginalisation by Western/Eurocentric ideology. Although Indigenous peoples have been subjected to comply with the rule of governance institutions that have failed to appropriately recognise Indigenous knowledge in its policies, there has been no shortage of research that attempts to understand and subsequently 'represent' Indigenous peoples, their stories, experiences, perspectives and languages through Western world view (Adyanga Akena, 2012; Kovach, 2009; Smith, 1999). Smith (1999) argues that Indigenous peoples have been subjected to scrutiny from "white research, academic research or outsider research" (p. 44) whereby "Indigenous peoples and their societies were (are) coded into the Western system of knowledge" (p. 45). Margaret Kovach (2009), writer of *Indigenous Methodologies*, explains that the suppression of Indigenous values and knowledge and the colonial accounts of Indigenous peoples collectively and individually have created misrepresentations. She states, "multi-level assumptions, both by dominant culture and those internally colonised, about

Indigenous peoples whereby much time is spent explicating who we are in contrast to a frozen-in-time identity" (p. 114).

A review and extensive analysis of governmental jurisdiction, policy and ways of working are beyond the boundaries of this research. However, it is important to acknowledge how decisions that are made and enforced by the bureaucrats of our country, enable me to see and give reason to the ongoing production of cultural hegemony and how it is blindly enforced and fixed in the consciousness of many people in society. Over recent months *The Guardian*, an Australian on-line newspaper, has published several articles (2015) that magnify the inherent denial of the Australian Government to engage in proper consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia. In February this year, Dr Chris Sarra, Aboriginal Australian and educator (The Guardian, 2015), provided a response to the Prime Minister's "Closing the Gap" speech, where it was announced that there was a "lack of positive progress in all but two areas" (2015, para.1). Sarra (2015) is challenged by the fact that half a billion dollars in funding has been withdrawn from community service providers, leaving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities "at the mercy of a clumsy and poorly executed 'advancement' strategy" (2015, para.4). In the same context and addressing similar affairs, as Federal opposition Leader Bill Shorten challenged the funding cuts to many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community service providers earlier this year, Members of Parliament walked out. Nova Peris, Aboriginal Australian athlete and Labor senator for the Northern Territory, also contributed a profound and angered address (2015) with regard to the blatant disrespect of Members walking out of parliament. She asserted, "as a nation people reflect on Australia as this nation of hope and opportunity; however, we are a nation that continually lets down Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. We are failing citizens of this country" (Peris, 2015).

Both Sarra (2015) and Peris (2015) powerfully proclaim that good intentions and an 'understanding' of the inequalities Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples face, is not good enough. Peris (2015) concedes that while the Prime Minister is disappointed that the gap has not closed, arguments that challenge the funding cuts of many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service providers "are falling on deaf ears, day in day out" (2015). The vision of 'closing the gap' is failing as a result of a

dysfunctional and divided government (2015). Sarra (2015) asserts that "our only chance (to close the 'gap') is to acknowledge and embrace the humanity of Aboriginal Australians, and invest in the pursuit of our excellence—for some, the greatest challenge is actually believing that Aboriginal people can be exceptional" (2015, para.9)."

The following section, 2.2.2, provides acknowledgement of some of the epistemological and ontological groundings of Indigenous peoples from different parts of the world.

2.2.2 Indigenous Epistemology and Ontology

This knowledge does not belong to my ancestry or me and it is with much respect and awareness of the devastation colonisation caused Indigenous peoples all over the world that I reflect on these learnings. This knowledge and way of being is something I will only ever know, feel and understand as an outsider. An increased awareness of Indigenous knowledge systems and the history of colonisation increase my awareness of the role that my own knowledge paradigm and hegemonies have and continue to play. Indigenous knowledge movements have inspired many Indigenous scholars, professionals and community people to contribute to the formalisation of pedagogies centred in Indigenous knowledges. Karen Martin (2008) discusses that Indigenous pedagogies are grounded in the fusion of knowing and being. Indigenous pedagogies and 'ways of doing' can be expressed and articulated through language, art, imagery, technology, social organisation and social control (Martin, 2008). Much literature states the critical importance of centralising Indigenous pedagogy throughout and within current educational learning paradigms (Arbon, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Battiste & Youngblood Henderson, 2009; Smith, 1999). Although diverse, unique and grounded in localised contexts, there are correlations between individual Indigenous pedagogies that reveal transformational elements within learning paradigms and provide learning experiences not addressed in Western education. Due to the vastness of Indigenous pedagogies the core focus of this section is to attend to the beliefs and conviction of Indigenous peoples in their visions for just and equitable learning paradigms.

Veronica Arbon (2008), author of *Arlthirnda Ngukarnda Ityirnda—Being, Knowing, Doing,* states that although it can be a difficult process to introduce and discuss the complex and diverse philosophies of Indigenous epistemology and ontology, it has and will continue to be a powerful way to challenge and escape the "imposed and destructive philosophies, ideologies and hegemony" (p. 30) from Western systems. Indigenous knowledge systems have been established for thousands of years and continue to develop and grow in complex and dynamic ways. When considering paradigms (how knowledge is managed and represented) it is clear that Western/European and Indigenous knowledges have been constructed within discourse in contrasting ways (Battiste & Youngblood Henderson, 2009; Kovach, 2009). As acknowledged in Section 2.2, Indigenous knowledge movements and the uprise of practicing Indigenous pedagogies are becoming more recognised as positive transformational practice in sites of learning, however, the struggle to displace the dominating power of Western knowledge in educational realms persists (Battisite, 2009; Kovach, 2013). Kovach (2013) asserts, "the desire to find common ground amid tensions and contradictions, the ability to problematize and disrupt normative practice, is often hard won in local educational environments" (p. 115). Battiste and Youngblood Henderson (2009) concur with this sentiment stating, "this task of naturalising Indigenous knowledge in European knowledge, to create a trans-systemic synthesis in education is a difficult and arduous journey" (p. 16). Battiste and Youngblood Henderson (2009) argue that "the challenge is how to balance colonial legitimacy, authority and disciplinary capacity with Indigenous Knowledge and pedagogies" (p.). Following on from this, Wilson (2003) asserts that an ongoing problem Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples face is the dominant Australian attitude that often only recognizes elements of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture understood and valued by the dominant Australian culture. While cultural misrepresentation continues to maintain commonplace in current laws and policy, Wilson (2003) asserts that "everything needs to be seen in the context of the relationship that is represents" (p. 161). The rise of Indigenous theories, methodologies and pedagogical practice formalised as academic research has given greater attention to the importance of practice and participatory-based research, collaborative consultation and a redefinition of 'relationship' between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people (Worby Et al., 2011). As acknowledged in Chapter One, concepts of reconciliation within the context of Indigenous jurisdiction are complex,

multilayered and not easily defined (if definable at all). This research project is concerned with intercultural encounters and subsequent relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians who endeavour to work together in a shared space, on a shared vision—"working to achieve a meeting of different but equally significant knowledges and knowledge systems" (Worby Et al., 2011, p. 222).

To this point, this chapter talks of the contested, challenging and complex space of intercultural encounters and collaboration. It also, however, acknowledges the potentiality of this space to create critical pedagogies drawn on a union of different and equally relevant knowledge systems. The concept of collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples is the core essence of this thesis. The intercultural space is challenged by a complex and contested history that continues to keep people contending with 'best' ways to negotiate collaborative practice. This research project aims to use reflections of intercultural collaboration to see whether these artefacts assist in providing a deeper awareness of the complexities that exist. Section 2.3 explores literature that addresses the site of intercultural interaction and collaboration.

2.3 PROCESSES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration can be defined as "the process of shared creation: two or more individuals with complementary skills interacting to create a shared understanding that none had previously come to on their own" (John-Steiner, 2011, p. 263). Individuals complement the intellectual capabilities, practice and subjective views and values of their collaborative counterparts. They enhance the stages of the collaborative process with their unique skills, personal qualities, and cultural and linguistic identity, providing a space where diversity, strengths and weaknesses can be collectively supported and contribute to a single desired effect (John-Steiner, 2011). Vera John-Steiner powerfully denotes "for a partnership to be truly creative —to change a discipline and transform a paradigm—multiple perspectives, complementary in skills and training and fascination with ones' partners contributions are also essential" (p. 64). The importance and emphasis placed on collaboration in its many facets and paradigms has increased in recent decades (John-Steiner, 2011). John-Steiner (2011) maintains, "our detailed knowledge of the processes involved in effective joint

endeavors is still limited" (p. 225). To achieve authenticity in collaboration, there is a need for more research that explicitly documents, critiques and celebrates the ongoing collaborative process rather than dependence on retrospective analysis of a final product (John-Steiner, 2011). This thesis in hand is restricted to discussing the contributions of only one person from two separate collaborative projects therefore I am limited in discussing the authenticity of the actual working relationships. Without the subjective perspective of other participants in the collaborative projects, for example Geoffrey Gurrumul Yunupingu (Michael Hohnen) or David Gulpili and Peter Djigirr (Rolf De Heer), there is no evidence to say how these partnerships benefitted all people. Therefore I maintain focus on different 'processes' of negotiation within moments of intercultural encounters and collaboration from the perspective of two subjectively different non-Indigenous peoples. I use these moments to discuss how *their* (De Heer's and Hohnen's) 'moments' and perspectives can be used to generate a critical dialogue about ongoing collaborative processes in intercultural contexts. I acknowledge that I cannot discuss authenticity of these partnerships.

2.3.1 Cultural Boundaries

Martin Nakata's conceptualization of the 'cultural interface'—"the space between the two knowledge systems", encourages and challenges non-Indigenous people to take their understandings "beyond their simple black/white dimensions" (Nakata, 2007, p. 9) and to critically reflect on how "histories, politics, the multiple and interconnected discourses, social practices and knowledge technologies" (Nakata, 2007, p. 9) powerfully influence how one sees the world and creates understandings in an ever changing reality. Nakata (2007) states:

> In this historical moment, when political autonomy is a possibility, it is critical that Indigenous people and those who are committed in their support for us develop deeper understanding of how we are positioned at the interface of different knowledge systems. (p. 12)

Nakata's concept of the 'Cultural Interface' provides an intercultural pedagogy that imparts knowledge about collaboration in an intercultural context. Colleen McGloin (2009), a non-Indigenous academic working at *Woolyungah* Indigenous centre

Wollongong, critically engages with Nakata's theory to guide her pedagogical practice as well as her collaborative interactions with Indigenous colleagues. McGloin (2009) explains that she "wants to make sense of how non-Indigenous academics function at, and contribute to this site of struggle: McGloin (2009) states, "How can I learn to understand protocol, how can we (non-Indigenous people) be effective contributors to a rigorous anti-colonial pedagogy and become savvy about what is required to support Indigenous politics?" (p. 36). McGloin (2009) asserts that for "non-Indigenous subjects at the interface, it is also a place for negotiation where, for the most part, unlearning can occur, and new knowledge given primacy… it can also be a site of struggle: the process of unlearning is never easy" (p. 39). When developing an intercultural, dialogical relationship, authentic communication and negotiation is crucial to the success of the evolving partnership. People who are engaged in processes of intercultural collaboration need to have an active awareness of the differences based on individual cultural foundations. Britta Kalscheuer (2008) critiques the possible links between intercultural communication and a postcolonial approach. She draws on the seminal theories of Edward T. Hall (1959) and his assertion that each culture has a hidden code of behaviours. People who share a similar 'culture' have ways of sharing a common language—a common language that is highly influential on particular ways of being. Kalscheuere (2008) states "that as long as people are not confronted with members of a different culture, their own culture seems natural and unquestioned" (p. 29). When people have chosen to place themselves in an intercultural context, intercultural communication depends on a high need to recognise the differences that exist. Without an active recognition of 'difference', the process of translating and negotiating ways of 'communicating' from one person's perception to another will not prevail. In order to be an effective intercultural communicator, one is "required to be in a permanent move and change of attitudes" (Kalscheuer, 2008, p. 30). Kalscheuer (2008) also asserts McGloin's (2009) sentiments—changing attitudes and ways of behaving in order to negotiate effective intercultural communication can be a difficult process as it often means unlearning particular ways of thinking and believing. Problems of intercultural communication arise when "neither side accepts the cultural specifics of other cultures as equally true" (Kalscheuer, 2008, p. 30). Hall (1959) established that "by studying the parts of the communication process in our own and other cultures we can come to recognise and understand a vast unexplored region of human behaviour that exists outside the range of people's conscious awareness, a silent

language that is usually conveyed unconsciously" (p. 1). By raising the cultural consciousness of people working and living in an intercultural society, ways of communicating become more dynamic creating greater potential for equal and more effective collaboration.

Rick Wallace's critical inquiry, "Power, Practice and a Critical Pedagogy for Non-Indigenous Allies" (2011), amplifies the theories of post-colonialism as he emphasises the importance of active listening to the voices and narratives of Indigenous peoples, especially if non-Indigenous peoples intend to be allies through collaboration. Wallace (2001) clearly maintains if non-Indigenous people intend 'solidarity', self-reflection during and after intercultural experience is critical to ensure "aspects of colonial practices" (p. 165) are not replicated. Wallace (2011) describes some of the necessary processes of reconciliation and collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous allies. He argues that "non-Indigenous peoples need to critically self-inspect the numerous ways our own narratives, behaviours and social structures are embedded in our identities in seemingly invisible ways, that reproduce a privileged status of dominance in our relationship with Indigenous peoples in Canada" (p. 156). Wallace (2001) explains that experiences in intercultural collaboration create opportunities to make visible non-Indigenous power. It is during these often unreflected upon times "non-Indigenous people can rethink their roles within that relationship via a self-reflective critical pedagogy concerning privileges, strategies and concrete practices" (p. 156). While this project does not 'listen' to the narratives of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander peoples, it does apply critical theory and post colonialism to the reflections of non-Indigenous peoples, in an attempt to discuss non-Indigenous power.

Within the school system, in locations of cross-cultural education, Sam Osborne (2013) acknowledges that non-Indigenous visiting educators to remote Aboriginal communities often find themselves caught between government discourse and the voices and values of the people in the communities. Osborne (2013) appeals for people to consider this: "while we're busy delivering 'education' is anybody learning anything?" (p. 172) He is not suggesting people abandon directives from formal system level education, but encourages people to consider, reflect and engage in high order thinking that explores the lived reality of the students they teach, based on the stories and feedback from the Anangu people in the communities where they're living

and working. In a similar context, Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist (2003) present success in Indigenous Education through a case study of a school in North East Arnhem Land, where a Yolngu principal had reformed the curriculum according to the two-ways teaching and learning philosophy, where "educators and community members are encouraged to dwell in the cultural interface and listen to each other's stories" (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003, p. 86). Through this curriculum reformation, visiting teachers came to see the power of Yolngu knowledge and philosophy for learning and reflect on the "arrogance of the White Australian imposition of narrow Western schooling" (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003, p. 87). They further report that through the collaborative nature of successful two way teaching and learning and the development of bilingual programs "Indigenous self-determination can become a reality" (2003, p. 87).

Within the realm of Education in Australia, partnerships between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities and non-Indigenous people are deemed of critical importance (Sarra, 2011; Wilson, 2003; Worby Et al., 2011; Nakata, 2007). Furthermore, being strong, knowledgeable and confident in two cultures is a common theme that emerges and is discussed at a critical level by Indigenous and non-Indigenous academics and educators (Nakata, 2007; Sarra, 2011; Martin, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Worby Et al., 2011; Wilson, 2003). Within school systems, an effective two-way teaching and learning approach supports understandings of, and respect for diversity and difference, allowing people to live and communicate with each other in a positive and respectful way (Sarra, 2011). In the 2011 publication of *Two Way Teaching and Learning* (Purdie, Milgate, Bell), Sarra (2011), Andersen (2011) and Kickett-Tucker & Coffin (2011) provide strategies for all educators that have the potential to lead to an improvement in educational outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students. The recommended strategies that correlate between authors suggest flexible and localized teaching and learning programs that embed the language and cultural identity of their students; embracing and supporting Aboriginal leadership and educators in the school community and high expectations based on the provision of strong, reciprocal relationships with students—furthermore, working together, engaging in authentic dialogue, active listening, cultural safety and developing community partnerships. These strategies depend on mutual and respectful partnerships between the school, student and their community and the active

awareness, attitude and behaviour that non-Indigenous people and educators have towards Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia.

The literature in this section maintains the importance of discourses that listen to and promote the voices of Indigenous peoples in localised contexts. These voices need to be listened to and considered as the foundation for critical self-reflections and critically informed actions. Actively listening and reflecting upon the stories and voices of Indigenous peoples, is an important element when considering intercultural encounters and collaboration. The literature in this section also concedes the importance of non-Indigenous peoples reflecting of their own contributions and methods of collaborative practice. This research project uses the notion of a third space (Bhabha, 1994) (a 'cultural interface') to explore the relational bindings in given moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. The following section maintains focus on the collective 'togetherness'—how people negotiate their behaviours in an intercultural space, while also troubling the process of retelling and constructing the story. Within sites of collaboration, deciding and agreeing on a shared vision and way of working can be a difficult process, especially between collaborators who are bound by power. Power relations effect and control the way knowledge is produced and enforced; therefore it cannot be assumed that prescriptive approaches represent what actually happens or what will happen at the site of intercultural collaboration. Developing relationships and ways of working together need to be negotiated. The following section introduces research that has focused on moments of intercultural encounters and collaboration rather than an exclusive focus on collaborative endeavours or methods of 'how to' collaborate. As relational bindings and ways of working in an intercultural space are explored and critiqued, a deeper awareness of the inability to define, code or provide select representations of this space is amplified.

2.3.2 Finding a Way, Together

Jane Selby (2007), in her work "Working Divides between Indigenous and non-Indigenous: Disruptions of Identity", challenges traditional forms of research that generate examples of intercultural interaction as unambiguous representations of the intercultural space, based on an analysis of people's personal narratives and intercultural experiences. She questions the subjectivities of researchers who claim

knowledge statements within a field so imbued with multiple distortions. The conditions and multiple subjectivities that emerge in moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration would not allow a totalizing representation of reality. Selby (2007) asserts that 'experiences' be read and interpreted with an "awareness that the nexus of experience, understanding and communication is complicated by the processes of mismatching as we individuate and link as social beings" (p. 145). Similarly to Selby (2007), Margaret Somerville and Tony Perkins (2003) engage with the critical and postcolonial theories of 'border crossing' to capture the negotiation of differences during a collaborative research process between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Somerville and Perkins (2003) assert that literature that explicates the collaborative processes between 'power relations' is often "prescriptive rather than analytical" and as a consequence, tend to "gloss over the negotiation of collaboration" (p. 255). Maintaining focus on the in-between space, where interactive moments between culturally diverse peoples emerge, presents opportunities for difference to be acknowledged and critiqued. Moments of intercultural collaboration are constructed in different ways for different members of the encounter depending on each individual's experiences and role in relation to the shared project (Somerville & Perkins, 2003). This space is not fixed—it is in constant motion and can take alternative paths, opposing initial plans and intentions. The way people negotiate intercultural encounters in a given moment is bound by the multiple subjectivities that exist and subsequently create difference. The analytical process of this thesis engages with the concept of multiple subjectivities in moments of collaboration. Somerville and Perkins (2003) concede that analyzing reflections on moments of intercultural collaboration assist in revealing the "essential emotional and intellectual work" (p. 264) of cultural contact—they describe this space as a 'discomfort zone'. The 'discomfort zone' "focuses on the productive potential of difference and the necessary work of choosing to put oneself in that space" (Somerville & Perkins, 2003, p. 264).

Another author and researcher who critiques the concept of intercultural collaboration is Historian Heather Goodall (2005). In her works "Writing a Life with Isabel Flick", Goodall (2005) speaks of the contested space of collaborative writing and practical reconciliatory projects between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the creation of oral histories. Goodall (2005) concedes that possibilities that suffice to the composure of "interacting, intersecting and mutually transformative histories of

Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, have diminished" (p. 69) as a result of the tensions working across boundaries of cultural difference. Subsequently, many young non-Indigenous historians avoid this space. The dispute between interracial relations is often grounded in wonderings of how non-Indigenous people 'fit in' to this space and in particular the contradictory nature between the actual relationships between people and how it is subsequently constructed as text (Goodall, 2005). It wasn't until Goodall (2005) worked on a personalised collaborative project with Isabel Flick, Aboriginal community activist, that she started to really question and critique how she "fitted into the frame" (p. 71). Once confronting how she was positioned, Goodall (2005) subjectively states she embarked on a negotiated journey with Flick and wrote up the processes of collaboration as an honest and reflective discourse. She not only reveals their collaborative endeavours but their "modus operandi" (p. 74)—their methodological ways of being, forged together. This research project in hand takes heed of the 'modus operandi' of each reflective output (the artefacts used for the purpose of analysis) and applies critical thought in order to inform processes of collaboration between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia.

I have used a similar entanglement of theoretical concepts as McGloin (2009), Selby (2007), Somerville and Perkins (2003) and Goodall (2005) and I have also engaged with their will to challenge the reproduction of rigid 'representations' of intercultural collaboration. Rather than "getting the research organised, writing it up as illustrative of their lives" (Selby, 2007, p. 146), the analysis of reflections on moments of intercultural collaboration need to challenge unambiguous interpretations. For example, Selby (2007) uses a process of 'mismatching' "ideal speech situations" (p. 144). The 'mismatch' denies clear and complete representations of self—"reflected in intersubjective relations with others" (p. 145) as well as the contextualised location. Selby (2007) emphasises that "observing and researching people's experiences, is fraught with complexity" (p. 153). Furthermore, as individual people think, read, interpret and analyse—"our writing and visions are never politically neutral" (p. 154). Just as people's actions and ways of being unfold in a certain way in a moment of intercultural interaction, my writing as a researcher is dependent on my influential subjectivity. Although it is tempting to allow the reflective outputs (as 'data') to be analysed as defensible representations of intercultural collaboration and apply deeper meaning to moments that still concern me, I am aware of my own subjectivities and

the subjectivity that emerges in single moments of intercultural encounters. I am also aware of my ability to change and challenge my own understandings, interpret and wonder about moments in different ways on any given day. For this reason, I use a post-qualitative inquiry as I explore the processes that prevail in the reflected upon moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. I am grounded in the need to continue to explore this complex (albeit wonderful) space as people work together towards the visions of a postcolonial future, but not at the risk of reinforcing an "apparent coherence of Western heritage." (Selby, 2007, p. 153) The penultimate section of this chapter provides a review of recent literature that has moved into the realm of post-qualitative inquiry. The following literature contributes to several works that support the methodology of this research project.

2.4 POST-QUALITATIVE RESEARCH: THE ONTOLOGICAL TURN

St. Pierre (2014) describes post-qualitative methodologies as an 'ontological turn' against humanist qualitative methodologies. She asserts that methodology should not be separated from the epistemology and ontology, however, so often humanist qualitative methodologies ignore the ontological (subjective ways of being) "in the epistemological rage for meaning" (p. 3). In an attempt to engage with 'post' theories many qualitative inquiries counter the ontological intentions of such and use a conventional humanist methodology for example coding and categorisation (St. Pierre, 2014). It is important to reiterate that I neither deny nor reject the worth and value of other methodological grounding and method designs (such as coding). Post-qualitative inquiry does not aim to replace existing qualitative or quantitative methodologies, but attempts to question methodological 'truths' and what counts as bone-fide research activity and its preoccupation and fascination with empiricism. I do not intend to provide solutions to the space of intercultural social practice. Nor do I intend to present findings that represent how to engage in intercultural collaboration. It is well beyond my jurisdiction to anchor the reflective outputs (as 'data') to fixed codes, categories or conceptualisations of 'how to' engage in the intercultural space—a 'space' grounded in immeasurable subjectivities, both human and non-human.

There are common elements between the convictions of post-qualitative scholars, for example, the critique of conventional humanist qualitative methodology (research that

places ‘human’ at the core of its inquiry) and the analytical method of thinking with theory (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Youngblood-Jackson, 2013; Lather, 2013; Martin & Kamberelis, 2013; Mazzei, 2013). Furthermore, as St. Pierre (2013) states, “these projects also take up and extend the ontological work of ‘post’ theorists” (p. 653). Methodological approaches to post-qualitative inquiry (much like its ontological reasoning) cannot be defined. Therefore I have explored the following literature to illustrate my understanding of post-qualitative inquiries, which has in turn inspired and guided my own post-qualitative analysis. The literature explores how ‘data’ has been read, thought about and analysed with theoretical concepts.

2.4.1 The Ontological Turn

Patti Lather (2013), author of “Methodology-21: What do we do in the Afterward?” asserts that post-qualitative inquiry aims to produce knowledge differently denying the “standpoint epistemologies” (p. 635) that privilege a humanist subject voice as “transparent descriptions of lived experiences” (p. 635) in search of the ‘truth’. The enunciations that articulate moments of intercultural encounter and collaboration, used for the analysis of this research will enable me to mobilize the ontology of third space cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994) and border crossing pedagogy (Giroux, 2005) which both concedes the fluid and ever evolving reality of cultural difference.

Adrian D. Martin and George Kamberelis (2013), authors of “Mapping Not Tracing: Qualitative Educational Research with Political Teeth”, turn to the postmodern/post-structural theories and the “ontology of *becomings* rather than being” (p. 670). Martin and Kamberelis (2013) embrace the concept of ‘mapping’ when engaging with ‘data’. They maintain that mapping is an analytical strategy for reading data and producing “generative rather than representational” (Martin & Kamberelis, 2013, p. 677) discourse. Representational discourse has the potential to misrepresent people, places, and things. As addressed in previous literature, representations of Indigenous peoples all over the world has had damaging effects on the legitimacy of Indigenous epistemology and ontology and has (and often still does) papered over the devastating act/s of colonization. Martin and Kamberelis (2013) concede that mapping used in research “does not represent reality but rather indexes the various ways reality might be produced and how different way of producing reality have different social, economic and political effects” (p. 673). When considering the potential differences

that exist at cultural borders, a representational analysis (such as coding or narrative) using the selected reflective outputs, would risk ascribing a meaning to a relationship, a location and collaborative processes that I (in reality) know very little about. Furthermore, moments of intercultural encounter are subjective to the "potential *becomings*" (Martin & Kamberelis, 2013) of the multiple and ambiguous subjectivities that are unbeknown until they happen and are subsequently reflected upon.

Alecia Youngblood Jackson (2013) uses post-humanist ontological theory to highlight the "entanglement of the human and non-human in scientific practices" (p. 742). She engages with Pickering's (1995) text "The Mangle of Practice" which assists in revealing the material agency in social science, subsequently displacing human agency from the center of Jackson's (2013) inquiry. Similarly, Lisa A. Mazzei's (2014) methodological turn emphasizes how as *both* human and non-human subjectivities emerge in moments of social practice "performative enactments not previously thought" (p. 744) simultaneously transpire. Mazzei (2014) embraces a 'diffractive reading' of data—guided by the feminist works of Karen Barad (2007). This process assists her in focusing on the differences that emerge in moments of social practice and how they are mutually becoming and connected. Rather than identifying and subjectively interpreting the seemingly similar moments that present themselves in data, through codes and categories, post-qualitative inquiry enters the social practice to reveal "the assemblage" of the "multiplicity, ambiguity and incoherent subjectivity" (Mazzei, 2014, p. 743) that temporally exist there. The following section provides a brief insight into how post-qualitative methodology unrolls in Youngblood Jackson's (2013) and Mazzei's (2014) respective inquiries.

Youngblood Jackson (2013) provides insight into her post-qualitative method of the 'mangle' when analyzing social practice. She engages with an interview response from an African-American professor named Cassandra. Youngblood Jackson (2013) selects a 'short episode' from the interview where Cassandra describes her office at the university and events that emerge as a result of how the office space had been utilized. Cassandra describes how she had established herself in the academy as a mentor for her students, in particular minority students. She describes how the site of her office became a place for 'hanging out' and mentoring, a place where predominantly African-American students would come and embrace the "open-door policy that welcomed

students into her office" (Youngblood Jackson, 2013, p. 745). Cassandra asserts that this offer was never intended to exclude 'white students'—however, within the "discursive and material field of the predominantly white university, Cassandra struggled with the non-human agency (her office)" (p. 754) as white students began accusing her of "reverse discrimination and showing favoritism for the black students"(p. 745). As Jackson (2013) reads and analyses Cassandra's episode with Pickering's (1995) 'Mangle', she demonstrates how "Cassandra's agency (i.e. her goals and practices) emerged in the discursive and material construction of what she did with her office" (p. 746). For example, Cassandra arranged her office and created a place (non-human agency) that "temporally emerged with human agencies—Cassandra's black and white student" (p. 746). Jackson Youngblood's (2013) analysis enables me to see how she used the text (as 'data') to inspire thinking with and through the post-humanist theory concept of Mangling practices, revealing the multiple subjectivities that temporally emerge in moments of social practice. She neither places priority on the human subject nor does she assume or give greater meaning to the agency of the human behaviours. For example, she does not assume or continue to interpret and give deeper meaning as to *why* Cassandra arranged the office the way she did, or assume and speak for the students, the silent subjectivities of the text. This inquiry assists me to see how Jackson Youngblood (2013) analyzed the human and non-human agency not in terms of "what they are, but what they do" (p. 746). She takes moments described in a text and articulates what this makes her think in relation to the theory, capturing the essence of post-humanist ontology.

Lisa Mazzei (2014) emphasizes paying close attention to the limits of what a text provides as she analyses 'data' using theory as a *process* rather than a *means* to create new conceptualizations. She illustrates the relevance of staying within the boundaries of what is actually recorded rather than spilling over into the unknown and making conceptualizations based on a researcher's subjective assumptions, generated from the perceptions of only *one* subjective character. Mazzei's (2014) inquiry assists me to see how she reveals connections between 'data' and theory as she is guided by Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1987) process of 'plugging in'. Mazzei (2014) asserts that rather than generating broad categories, themes and codes based on the collected or selected 'data', she uses 'data' to 'plug in' (as a process) to mobilize and illustrate concepts already theorized about in order to "read the data and theory through one another" (p.

744). For example, Mazzei (2014) uses a diffractive reading of the ideas presented in a short excerpt taken from an interview with 'Brenda', a first generation college graduate. Brenda was asked to respond to how her relationships in life have "changed as a result of becoming an academic" (p. 744). Mazzei (2014) 'plugs in' to Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1987) and Barad's (2007) theoretical concepts. Mazzei states:

> To read the data diffractively through the insights of desire and intra-action is to engage questions about how Brenda is simultaneously producing material effects (leaving her husband for her intellectual lover as a production of desire) and how she is simultaneously materially and discursively produced (as becoming a woman and as no longer being a wife). (p. 745)

Although these post-qualitative inquiries do not provide a procedural, step-by-step method for analysis or contribute specifically to the realm of intercultural practice, their methodological turns provide insight into what post-qualitative analysis can look like. Post-qualitative research contributes an alternative way to engage and interpret qualitative texts. I have engaged with the post-colonial space, in particular, the location where moments of intercultural encounters and collaborations are emergently performed in a 'mangle'. I have 'plugged in' (Mazzei, 2014) to Homi Bhabha's (1994) third space and Giroux's (2005) border crossing locations and engaged with the concepts of cultural hybridity (how differences move together) to reveal multiple subjectivities (both human and non-human) at sites of intercultural encounters and collaboration. These inquiries (Youngblood Jackson, 2013; Mazzei, 2014) and many more alike (Lather, 2013; Tuck & Wayne Yang, 2014; St. Pierre, 2013; Martin & Kamberlis, 2013; Childers, 2014) assist and support me in making connections between the reflective outputs ('data') and theoretical concepts. Furthermore, this literature has raised my critical awareness of the troubling space of 'data'. While I do not intend to provide an overarching 'answer' to my research 'question', the ontological turn of post-qualitative inquiry assists in helping me explore how intercultural interactions can support the endeavors of intercultural collaboration.

2.5 SUMMARY

This research project has sought to address the intercultural processes that are evident in reflective outputs of intercultural collaboration and negotiation. By using a post-qualitative inquiry, I attempt to use the reflective outputs to mobilise the theories I embrace to see how this can inform the processes of collaboration. I have approached this research with great awareness of the devastating effect of Western knowledge and empiricism on the cultural orientation of Indigenous peoples all over the world. This chapter acknowledges the misrepresentation of Indigenous people through Western discourses. Furthermore it also troubles the pedagogical processes of engaging in collaborative endeavors that are respectfully negotiated and do not deny Indigenous peoples epistemology and ontology. An important element that arises in most of the literature is the need for self-reflection and an awareness of how Western ideology is enforced in Australian and other colonized societies. While there is a growing increase of Indigenous academics and educators challenging the field of Western academia, there is common call for more non-Indigenous peoples who engage in collaborative intercultural projects with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia to challenge and provoke the processes of collaboration and engage in an anticolonial ontology—especially when provided with the opportunity to explicate experiences as written and published discourse (Goodall, 2005; McGoin, 2007; Selby, 2007; Somerville & Perkins, 2003). There is much literature that provides guidance for non-Indigenous peoples entering into intercultural partnerships; there are also many projects as a result of collaborative endeavors. However, this research project has sought to use publicly available discourses that reflect moments of collaboration to reveal negotiations in order to mobilize the theories that support postcolonial and critical theory thought. The colonial legacy of much Western discourse has encouraged me to focus on how differences are negotiated in different moments of intercultural collaboration, (especially how the subjectivity of non-indigenous people can challenge the ideological imbued boundaries of difference) rather than focus on providing methods of *how to*. Chapter Three will reintroduce the theories I have engaged with that assist my evolving ideas, thinking and ways of engaging in the phenomena of intercultural collaboration.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The theoretical grounding for this research has been constructed within a critical theory paradigm and explored with a postcolonial lens. I use elements of these theories to think about and analyze interactions and processes of intercultural collaboration and negotiation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

In Section 3.2, I briefly explain the historical components and key influence of critical theory that relate to the overarching research questions of this research, in particular, how elements that relate to power structures and social inequalities locate and develop contextualized theories in Indigenous methodology. Section 3.3 introduces critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy is often denoted as a complex and dynamic theory—a productive process of action and reflection with which people engage and live, guided by a deepened awareness of the politics and power imbued in social movements. I have drawn on the seminal theories of Paulo Freire (1970), namely pedagogy of the oppressed and border pedagogy. Freire's (1970, 1998) theories provide a basis when reflecting on the core essence of this project, as he explicitly names and defines elements of a 'visionary' humanity. In Section 3.4 I formally introduce and explain the concepts of postcolonial theory used to read and interpret the reflective outputs. Homi K. Bhabha's (1994) concepts—enunciations of cultural hybridity in the third space—will be used to explore negotiations at and within the boundaries of cultural difference. This section will also denote the ontological and epistemological principles of post-colonialism that guide my methodological groundings. In Section 3.5 I draw on Giroux's (2005) theories of border crossing pedagogy, which will be used in an entanglement with Bhabha's cultural hybridity. Section 3.6 considers the role of language in discourse and the relationship of language with power and knowledge.

3.2 CRITICAL THEORY

Critical theory is the process of thought, critique and methodology. Through revealing relationships of domination in society and the critique of "how knowledge is produced,

whose knowledge is valued and how control of such knowledge equates to power in society" (Ryoo & McClaren, 2010, p. 348), critical theory challenges dominant ideologies and defies the suppression of human consciousness. Critical theory is also a process of self-conscious thought whereby people are inspired to engage in dialogical relationships that instigate transformative and emancipatory practice. Critical and cultural theorists are concerned with how the dominant ideologies of a culture have the power to undermine and dominate other ideologies through social institutions and systems and the media (Ryoo & McClaren, 2010). Elements of critical theory are important in the groundings of this research as I explore the processes of collaboration within moments of intercultural encounters and subsequently support the way in which I 'answer' my research question. As I explained in the Literature Review, I have engaged in this research with a critical awareness of the inequalities and power structures of Western knowledge constructs that dominate educational institutions and suppress Indigenous epistemologies and ontology. Critical theories have supported a growing awareness and exposure of "relationships of domination and subordination as well as the contradictions in which humankind is entrenched" (Ryoo & McClaren, 2010, p. 348). Ideologies emphasise the connection between social systems, personal identity, morals and beliefs and the epistemological understandings people in the world stand by. Cultural hegemony is the process whereby a particular social and cultural group has the power to influence the thoughts, expectations and behaviours of the rest of society through the enforcement of normative ideas that in turn become the dominant worldview of a society (Ryoo & McClaren, 2010). An active awareness of ideology and cultural hegemonies assist in revealing inequalities in society. This line of thought is explored in the section below.

3.2.1 Ideology and Cultural Hegemony

Antonio Gramsci, an Italian Marxist theorist, considered how domination in society is brought about through cultural hegemony and the intertwined relationship between 'culture' and 'power' (Smith, 2008). Cultural hegemony is achieved when the majority maintain a neutral understanding of ideologies that are applied in education, the media, religion, politics, the law, and abide by these 'normative ideas', subsequently reinforcing the domination of a ruling class and culture (Ryoo & McClaren, 2010). A neutral understanding of ideologies avoids the identification of variations and

differences within and across systems or cultural groups and identities. As a result, the interests, ideas and beliefs of one group dominate, and inequality in society ensues.

In attempt to examine the intercultural interactions and processes of collaboration in reflective outputs, I am also concerned with how Western ideologies and agency often dominate the process and production of projects that concern Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia. Ideologies and agencies imposed by Western knowledge constructs have the potential to dominate the sub-conscious thoughts and actions of non-Indigenous peoples masking how power dynamics and control can be so easily enforced in processes of intercultural collaboration. An example of how race-related cultural hegemony is achieved in Australia is through language ideologies. In Australia the dominant language and the language of Governance, Education, Health, Economics and the Law is Standard Australian English. Language ideologies have the power to create inequalities and problematic implications for people who do not identify with dominant language. The following section provides examples of cultural hegemony through language ideologies addressed by Richard Trudgen, a non-Indigenous man who has been working with Yolngu communities in Arnhem Land for many years. The word *Yolngu* refers to Aboriginal peoples in northeast Arnhem Land and *Balanda* is used to refer to non-Indigenous or European person (Trudgen, 2000). Rev. Dr. Djiniyini Gondarra, political leader of the *Golumala* clan and member of the council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, wanted his friend Richard Trudgen to:

> Speak to Balanda about the real situation we, Yolngu people, face in our lives every day—a reality that is hard for people of another culture to imagine. (Trudgen, 2000, p. 3)

In the text *Djambatj Mala: Why Warriors Lie Down and Die,* Trudgen (2000) presents many forms of cultural hegemony. He delineates the detrimental impact cultural hegemony has on *Yolngu* people in Arnhem Land by highlighting the problematic implications of dominant language ideologies. Trudgen (2000) asserts that inadequate communication is the main factor in the current health crisis endured by many *Yolngu* people in Arnhem Land and aligns this issue with the devastating processes of colonisation, describing it as "a war of words" (p. 67). He states that "this communication problem is not easily understood by the dominant Australian culture…

yet the wider Australian community is an active participant in the 'war' without realising it. Ignorance about the communication crisis leads many to become unwitting agents in the battle" (Trudgen, 2000, p. 67). Incorrect perceptions of another's world—their beliefs, behaviours, and customs—create cultural conflict. Conflict doesn't arise as a result of 'difference', but through ignorance of difference and perceptions of superiority. When one isn't encouraged to critically consider another's culture, the ability to further understand the extent to which cultural identity not only defines others, but the way others relate to them, is hindered, consequently creating an intolerant disregard for others, breakdown in communication, inequality and power imbalance (Develtere, Elsen & Pollet, 2007).

As shown through Trudgen's (2000) example, critical theory renders visible the injustices within society created by the constraints of ideology and cultural hegemony. My research explores some of the subjectivities that create differences in the event or process of intercultural encounter and collaboration. The critical elements of ideology and cultural hegemony will enable me to critically consider the subjectivities in each given moment of intercultural encounter. The following section explores ways critical theories have been reinterpreted and applied to localised contexts, including my own study.

3.2.2 Western Constructs of Critical Theory

It is important to state that interpretations, interrogative questioning or in-depth discussions of Indigenous knowledge is not the intention of this dissertation. However, an acknowledgement, exploration and the learning of Indigenous knowledge systems within a critical theory framework is necessary to provide a guiding force in helping to place theories and practices within a relevant cultural and postcolonial space. A common theme of working collaboratively in an intercultural team is the need for people to not only contextualise ways of working to ensure collaborators can share and learn from each other in a mutually respectful way but to also critique the way different ideology influences the respective relationship. When using critical theories it is important to ground understandings in an open and flexible way, contextualised within political and historical locality. Indigenous peoples all over the world are reinstating their agency producing "organic and Indigenous approaches to research, which has led

to the development of a world Indigenous movement" (Smith, 1999, p. 169). Many Indigenous scholars, educators and community peoples have used critical theories as a grounding to critique the implications of Western ideology and the effects of cultural hegemony on Indigenous knowledges, languages and cultures (Smith, 1995; Smith, 1999; Kovach, 2009; Nakata, 2009; Grande, 2013). As explained in the Literature Review, this movement is creating 'decolonised' discourses encapsulating both pre- and post- colonial times.

Martin Nakata (2000) states that people are subconsciously conditioned to view and comprehend the positions of Indigenous peoples in the "same systems of thinking, logic and rationality that have historically not served Indigenous interests at all" (p. 12). Margaret Kovach (2009) agrees when considering the theoretical and practical foundations of Indigenous inquiries and research projects. She asserts that conceptual frameworks "inherently centre in Western epistemology, thus manufacturing and reproducing Western epistemology as a normative standard within research" (2009, p. 41), providing little systemic shift in the ideology of knowledge production. Decolonised discourses have challenged the legacies of colonial power by confronting authority and discourse that are linked to keeping "privilege and oppression alive as active constituting forces of daily life within the centres and margins of power" (Giroux, 2005, p. 12).

Section 3.3 addresses the role of critical pedagogy in the theoretical development of this research project. Pedagogy is a word often used in educational settings to describe the practice of passing on knowledge (Inglis & Aers, 2012). For the purpose of this research project, pedagogy is used to refer to the practice of engaging in collaborative endeavours with others. Furthermore, pedagogy refers to the process of creating discourses for the purpose of imparting learning and ideas. *Critical* pedagogy is the awareness of the ideologically imbued and unequal realms the practice and production of particular pedagogies occurs and the active acknowledgement in the political elements that create this.

3.3 CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

Denzin (2009) informs that critical theory has taken the literal concept of 'pedagogy' out of a purely educational space and placed it "first within the political, then the performative arena…it is always ideological, always political, and always already performative" (p. 383). As non-Indigenous people participate in intercultural working relationships, it is important to interrogate the damage of colonisation in conjunction with learning about, honouring and respecting the "already performative" (Denzin, 2009, p. 383). I think of the 'already performative' as the Indigenous ways of 'doing', grounded in ways of 'being' and 'knowing' within a local contextualised space. Whilst considering processes of collaboration and interaction, I am also concerned with ensuring the collaborative efforts of non-Indigenous peoples do not deny Indigenous peoples their knowledges, skills, beliefs and practices by dominating the 'learning space' and creating projects based on the ideals of Western knowledge and ideology. Often power imbalance and deep injustices can occur between peoples as a result of "unconscious assumptions and reactions of well-meaning people that are supported by the media and cultural stereotypes as well as by the structural features of bureaucratic hierarchies and market mechanisms" (Young, 1990, p. 41). Although elements of critical pedagogy tend to apply fixity to identity and have humanistic tendencies, they have guided and given me insight into the inequalities that exist in educational realms. Theories of critical pedagogy, relevant to intercultural partnerships, have provided discourses that enable me to critically consider and engage with political discussions concerning cultural hegemony and Western colonial domination.

Seminal theories of Paulo Freire (1970, 1998, 2005) are commonly engaged with by critical theorists and pedagogues such as hooks (1992), Giroux (1992, 2005), McLaren and Leonard (1992) and Grande (2013). Freire's principles have provided a platform to not only deconstruct the power and force of cultural hegemony and Western ideology within education paradigms but also reconstruct them in alternative and different contexts and locations. Some people, such as Giroux (1992, 2005), hooks (1992) and Grande (2013) use Freire's theories to critique (and at times criticize) his humanistic characteristics and tendency to privilege discourses that view class as the basis of social and political life, however, they acknowledge and respect the transformative essence of his work. hooks (1992) states that "Paulo was one of the thinkers whose work gave me a language…his work furthered my own struggle against the colonizing process" (p. 146). Giroux (2005) concedes, "regardless of Paulo's initial

theoretical flaws… he gave the term a political (critical pedagogy) importance and international significance that it had lacked" (p. 196). Considering that Giroux's (2005) theories of border crossing pedagogy are inspired and conceptualised through the groundings of Paulo Freire, I also draw on some of his theories that have enabled me to apply critical thinking to the space of intercultural encounter and collaboration. Guided by the notion of 'solidarity', that is working together, I use his theories as pedagogy to increase my theoretical understanding of the political and power infused space I am exploring. I will first outline Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) and place it within the context of this inquiry, before moving into identified characteristics of a 'critical pedagogue' before briefly addressing the concept of critical consciousness as an attribute that supports the negotiation of cultural difference.

3.3.1 Pedagogy of Solidarity

Critical Pedagogy acknowledges the realities of dehumanization in the world and is concerned with the "injustice, exploitation, oppression and the violence of the oppressors" and the "yearning of the oppressed for freedom and justice, and their struggle to recover their lost humanity" (Freire, 1970, p. 26). In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1970) theorises the attributes of human action in the creation of a critical pedagogy that advocates for the liberation of the 'oppressed'. Freire's (1970) use of the words 'oppressed/oppressor' are linked to 'dehumanization'. He asserts that "dehumanization, which marks not only those whose humanity has been stolen, but also those who have stolen it, is a distortion of the vocation of becoming more fully human." (p. 26). Although often criticised for his binary accounts of social relations Freire's conceptualisations have been used to acknowledge the historical context and to inform how relations have been previously formed. Freire (1970) acknowledges that he had no concrete experience in cultural action and concedes that he would "be satisfied if among the readers of this work there are those sufficiently critical to correct mistakes and misunderstandings, to deepen affirmations and to point out aspects not perceived" (p. 21).

The terms 'oppressed' and 'oppressors' have been widely defined therefore it is important to place the words in the context of this inquiry. The inherent formal power

imbalance that has been explored in the Literature Review of Chapter Two, between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the creation of collaborative projects, pertains to the elements of dehumanisation. Dehumanisation of Indigenous peoples and their knowledges frequently arises in the processes of collaboration, which detracts from the authenticity of the project. The concept of oppressed and oppressor are used with the intention of raising the awareness of the inherent power dynamics between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia. The characteristics are based on the historical understanding and acknowledgement of the pervasive and profound acts of colonisation and how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' autonomy and self-governance was not destroyed as a result of invasion, but oppressed by the colonizing forces of white power which "prevented the continuing exercise of sovereign authority by Aboriginal people" (Mansell, 2003, p. 15). 'Oppressed' and 'oppressors' is not used to totalise or apply a deficit label for people engaged in intercultural collaboration or for Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in general. These concepts are used in this context as a representation of how power—especially that of Western ideology and cultural hegemony—can have an oppressive effect on members of an intercultural team. It is an acknowledgement of how Eurocentric consciousness can subliminally over-empower and consequently dehumanise the collaborative experience. Youngblood Henderson (2000) concedes that often "Eurocentric thinkers do not understand the elegance of Aboriginal thought and do not question the myths of colonial thought" (p. 252).

When non-Indigenous peoples make the choice to engage in collaborative projects with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, I believe it is critical to maintain a reflexive awareness of the consequences that may pertain to the power dynamics in particular relationships. Freire (1970) argued that to ensure a transformation of the collaborations that suppress the epistemological, ontological and cosmological systems of an oppressed people, pedagogies need to be developed by the 'oppressed' grounded in their perceptions, ideas, beliefs and knowledge systems. Literature reviewed in Section 2.2 (Smith, 1999; Nakata, 2001; Battiste & Youngblood-Henderson, 2009) revealed the predispositions of educational institutions to revert to the 'majority' culture for solutions across a range of disciplines, creating ongoing challenges for minority groups as they contend with the social, economic and political

differences. This theme of 'reverting to the majority' is commonly ascribed to the colonial relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

Freire (1970) asserts that those who deny the humanity of the other are themselves dehumanized through "an unjust order that engenders violence in the oppressors" (p. 44). Sandy Grande (2013), in her reconceptualization of Freire's '*Pedagogy of the Oppressed'* insists on a focus on the forms of Western consciousness that continue to challenge and suppress Indigenous knowledges—knowledge systems that represents a contending vision to the dominant patterns of thinking and being (Grande, 2013). Furthermore, and in response to Freire's assertion, Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh and Teddy (2009) suggest that solutions to disparities (within the Maori context) perhaps "lie elsewhere, in the sense-making and knowledge-generating processes of the culture the system marginalizes" (p. 735). With the intention of strengthening the connections between race, culture and pedagogy, scholars and educators and cultural workers have used the essence of critical pedagogy and created new 'praxis' (the cyclic process of action and subsequent critical reflection) grounded in race-based relations and cultural epistemologies (Lynn, 2004). When applying theories at grassroots level, Denzin and Lincoln (2008) discuss the concept of re-visioning critical pedagogy to ground its theories and methodology in localized Indigenous contexts. These methods are used to inform actions of social justice, are political and moral and emerge through a commitment to "dialogue, community, self-determination and cultural autonomy" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 2). Denzin and Lincoln (2008) also assert that Indigenous knowledge systems should be recognized and respected as powerful contributors to bringing about social change. Localized critical theories need to bring participants into the research to create a shared space where the goals of critique, resistance and struggle are relevant and localized.

Freire's (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* connects to themes that explore the concept of solidarity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Many of the terms used throughout this research inquiry hold diverse and often complex meanings in an intercultural context. What constitutes as an authentic and mutually-respectful 'solidarity' between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples cannot be defined. The theoretical basis acknowledges the practice of solidarity between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples relates to ongoing issues of power and inequality. Collaboratively

working together in an intercultural partnership requires the integration of Indigenous and Western ways of working. In exploring articulations of intercultural collaboration in my analysis, it is critical that I have an understanding of how Western epistemologies are privileged and often dominate methodological processes in Indigenous inquiries. Although many non-Indigenous peoples who engage in collaborative projects with Indigenous peoples assume good intentions, without a critical awareness of the dehumanising effects that can arise in this complex and indefinable space, they risk treating their collaborative counterpart as objects "which must be saved" (Freire, 1970, p. 47). As a consequence, people risk recreating the colonial dilemmas that have previously and continue to, create certain oppressive circumstances.

Freire (1970, 1998) used the term 'conscientizaco' as he referred to critical consciousness and describes the process as relying on a comprehensive consideration and ongoing interpretation of our own individual experiences in the world. Critical consciousness refers to a learning process that challenges people to perceive social, political and economic contradictions in our world and to take action against the inequalities in society. Freire (1998) explained his understanding of 'conscientizacao' as the process in which people achieve a deepening awareness both of the sociocultural reality that shapes their lives and of their capacity to alter that reality. The cultural, historical and current social foundation of people is important when negotiating ways of working in an intercultural space. A critical consciousness, much like the notion of cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994), supports people in the complex process of negotiating best ways of working to ensure the relationship is neither one of power, control, resentment nor ongoing misunderstandings that are not sought to be solved. Critical consciousness supports the transformation of ways of working, both individually and in solidarity, and provides an opportunity for people to express the reality of their relationship in their own 'creative language' (Freire, 1998).

An evolving critique of critical theory and critical pedagogy using a variety of traditions, namely postmodernism, feminism and cultural studies, has led to new analyses of Western racial hierarchies of language, cultural identity and education (Giroux, 2005). An important consideration when engaging with critical theories is to be mindful of the ways that literature and discourses construct identities in binary

oppositions. Binary opposition refers to explanations that conceptualise two related; yet opposing concepts (Giroux, 2005). These definitions ascribe cultural, linguistic and social discrepancies and are often used to assist in guiding emancipatory social encounters (Giroux, 2005). Smith (1999) states: "Differences between Western and indigenous conceptions of the world have always provided stark comparisons" (p. 45). Indigenous and Western knowledge systems are different. Bhabha (1994) asserts that the notion of 'difference' is a process of signification *of* culture or *on* culture—differentiating between legitimate but discriminate knowledges. The problem is, however, Indigenous knowledges have been perceived as 'stark' representations through imperialistic perceptions and conceptualised as ambivalent cultural authority, in an attempt to dominate in the name of cultural supremacy which is itself produced in the moment of differentiation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 51). Cultural hybridity provides a means to see moments of intercultural encounter and collaboration unfold, and reveals the meeting place of 'difference' and how the subjectivities imbued in that particular moment take flight.

Drawing on discourses that maintain focus on difference as separate entities requires critique to ensure that not only the history that pertains to the binary is considered, but also the possibilities of the here and now and the beyond (Bhabha, 1994). This research project uses the emancipatory characteristics of critical theories alongside elements of post colonialism to guide away from binary oppositions and maintain focus on negotiating moments of intercultural collaboration. The following section formally introduces post-colonial theory, in particular those of Homi. K. Bhabha (1994). Bhabha's (1994) concept of enunciations of cultural hybridity (articulations of the way people negotiate or conceptualise their intercultural experience) in the third space (metaphorical location of the experience) are pivotal in the analytical processes of this research and will be explained throughout the following section.

3.4 POSTCOLONIAL THEORY

3.4.1 Postcolonial Discourses

Postcolonial theory critically considers knowledge structures and subsequently challenges established disciplinary knowledge, in particular the impact of Western

colonisation (Chavez, 2009). Postcolonial theorists have challenged critical theory to recognise how Western colonisation has and continues to produce cultural hegemony through the control of knowledge and knowledge production in binary accounts of difference (Ryoo & McLaren, 2010). Critical theories grounded in postcolonial and Indigenous agency assist in the deconstruction of the "epistemological 'edge' of the West" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 46). Whereas critical theories constructed from the perspectives of Western thought and theory enable "the authentication of histories of exploitation and the evolution of strategies of resistance" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 9). Giroux (2005) denotes the importance of language (such as decolonised discourses) to produce diverse meanings and social identities. He proclaims, "it is in language that human beings are inscribed and give form to those modes of address that constitute their sense of the political, ethical, economic and social" (Giroux, 2005, p. 12). I have been inspired to embrace post-colonial theories, combined with those of critical theory to assist in questioning and rejecting homogenous and binary ways of representing/writing about Indigenous peoples or social and cultural interaction. Giroux (2005) explains the necessity of exploring new ideas and ways of conveying the politics of difference within different social, cultural and economic locations. Intercultural collaboration takes place in a myriad of locations, across multiple disciplines by a diverse range of peoples from dynamic social, cultural and economic positioning. This is an important element to remember and actively acknowledge when analysing or exploring contexts that are constantly evolving and imbued with limitless subjectivities. Moments of encounter or collaboration with *anyone* are full of potentiality and always becoming, therefore impossible to define or control. What I can explore, is how the 'politics of difference' within moments of intercultural encounter and collaboration are negotiated, accommodated and subsequently have effect on the beyond.

Post-colonial theorist Homi K. Bhabha (1994) claims that critical theories must "open up the chasm of cultural difference" (p. 45) and include the effects of difference in order to deconstruct and challenge the assumptions of the 'West'. Although critical theories relate to revealing inequalities and notions of the power and control of dominating social constructs, its discourses have tendencies to totalise experiences and produce 'connective narratives' grounded in Western interpretations (Bhabha, 1994). When considering intercultural encounters and collaboration and the knowledge

systems that inform the process, "the representation of difference must not be hastily read as the reflection of pre-given ethnic or cultural traits set in the fixed tablet of tradition" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 3). For the purpose of this research, I do not claim to define, explain or represent 'cultural difference'. Rather, I focus on the subjective moments of intercultural interaction. Intercultural collaboration opens 'interstices' (in-between space) where there is an opportunity where 'difference'—for example, race, class, gender, geographical and political location, sexual orientation—can be negotiated by individuals as cultural hybrids. It is important to note that these 'opportunities' are fraught with complexities. I acknowledge that people in society are not awarded the same rights and as a consequence, inequalities based on culture, race, gender, age, tradition can affect ones power to negotiate or even the availability of a negotiation process. Bhabha (1994) emphasises the need to question how representations of such a space come to be formulated and generalised when within each site, each moment is imbued with competing claims and with the multiplicity of diverse, emergent and ever changing subjectivities. As explored in the Literature Review of Chapter Two, prescriptive methods of intercultural collaboration often neglect the complexity of intercultural interaction—neglecting to provide insight into negotiation of difference and the challenges and complexities people face. Bhabha (1994) states "the postcolonial perspective resists attempts at holistic forms of social explanation" (p. 248) and will therefore guide this research project as I attempt to deny constructing this particular research as totalising representations of intercultural encounters and collaboration. Once again, I articulate a limitation of this research—I have not included the narrative of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and only provide subjective perspectives based on Western interpretation. However, through Hohnen's (2011) and De Heer's (2007) essays I search for elements that generate a dialogue that deconstructs and challenges the assumptions of the 'West' (Bhabha, 1994). I engage with various concepts of post-colonialism to explore, question and reveal some intertwined agencies that dwell on the surface of texts that explicate intercultural encounters and experiences. The reflective outputs (as 'data') used for this research share reflections on moments of intercultural encounter, collaboration and partnership. The separate primary voices of the reflective outputs—Rolf De Heer in "Reflections on Whiteness and three film projects" and Michael Hohnen in "Hohnen and Gurrumul are collaborators"—conceptualise their ways of working in an intercultural space, providing a 'temporal' and personal narrative.

Bhabha (1994) refers to accounts and personal narratives as a form of social temporality of cultural memory—a social and textual affiliation where "emergent histories may be written, the re-articulations of the 'sign' in which cultural identities are inscribed" (p. 246).

The notion of temporality troubles definite descriptions of cultural identity and the concept of "homogenous national cultures" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 7). Temporal moments reveal contradictions, discontinuities, the multiplicity of difference and subjective diversity imbued within cultural boundaries. Temporal moments disrupt notions of fixity and 'collusive' understandings of cultural identity and present a new and emergent moment for cultural translation and negotiation (Bhabha, 1994). For the purpose of this research project, I will focus on the articulations of intercultural encounter as moments of temporality—temporary moments of intercultural interaction and moments of collaboration revealing "symbolic interaction" (Bhabha, 1994, p, 5). Bhabha (1994) describes the metaphorical and abstract location of the third space ("in-between the designations of identity") (p. 5) as processes of symbolic interaction. Moments where different symbols emerge that represent (only for that moment) different individual identities interacting as cultural hybrids, entangled with the non-human presence within the context, creating the "hither and thither" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 5).

Bhabha (1994) refers to the third-space as "'in-between the designations of identity…it opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy" (p. 4). This concept of cultural hybridity denies the oppositional colonial binaries that attempt to represent and "give a hegemonic 'normality' to the uneven development and the differential (often disadvantaged) histories of nations, race, communities and people" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 246). Postcolonial and critical perspectives have enabled me to consider the in-between location of third space—the 'interstices' where fixed identifications do not exist and moments of intercultural engagement are "temporal movements" that deny the emerging subjectivities "from settling into primordial polarities" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 5).

I have taken Bhabha's concept of symbolic interaction within the third space and applied it to temporal moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. These

‘moments’ are articulated as ‘enunciations’ of cultural hybridity—the emergent and performative act of cultural translation that explores processes of negotiation and accommodation at and within cultural boundaries. Documented moments of cultural hybridity—the way subjects, in their multiplicity, entangle—to enable a social imagery of the intercultural space. Bhabha (1994) refers to this as the ‘third space of enunciation’—the “inscription and articulation of cultures hybridity” (p. 56), the “indeterminate space of the subjects” (p. 55). An enunciation “ensures that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity” (p. 55). I have used this ontology to apply analysis to moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration to provide imagery at and within the borders of a third space. I maintain focus on the ‘in-between’ where “designations of identity” (p. 4) are entangled and unable to be fixed to a category or description that denies hybridity.

I have selected segments from the reflective outputs that capture moments of cultural hybridity—moments where multiple and undefinable subjectivities move together—and named them ‘enunciations’. For example, when someone articulates (‘enunciates’) *their* moments of intercultural interaction, they are from their subjective interpretation and made up of subjects that *they* deem important and relevant to discuss. Bhabha’s (1994) theories of Cultural Hybridity assist me to think about multiple identities working as ‘hybrids’ each bringing different ways of being that in effect influence the processes of negotiation.

Although Bhabha (1994) does not enter into deep conversation or exploration of materiality or non-human agency, there are moments in the analysis of the reflective outputs I engage in the acknowledgement of non-human agency in temporal moments of social interaction. Furthermore, Karen Lillian Martin (2008) informs me that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander post-colonialism challenges colonial and Western constructs of knowledge that deny Aboriginal agency and sovereignty. Sovereignty is the legitimate recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ relationship to country, “all things within, material or non-material” (Martin, 2008, p. 53). Martin (2008) talks of the inextricable connection between Indigenous peoples and their connections to land, Country and the “relatedness to the Creators and Ancestors, the Spirits and other Entities” (Martin, 2008, p. 75), for example, Waterways, Plants, Animals (Martin, 2008). Many Indigenous scholars (and many

Aboriginal people I know and am connected with) inform me of the importance of this knowledge and the vital role these connections play in the ontology and pedagogy of forming human relationships (Arbon, 2008; Nakata, 2009; Battiste, 2000; Kovach, 2009; Smith, 1999; Martin, 2008). Although an in-depth exploration or interpretation of non-human and materiality does not present in this research project, (especially an interpretation of Indigenous materiality) a recognition and acknowledgement of the legitimate subjectivity of non-human and material elements present (as symbolic interaction) (Bhabha, 1994) in moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration is explored in the analysis.

The reflective outputs will enable me to explore the elements that emerge in each temporal moment "within the boundaries of the social discourse" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 246). Although I maintain an active awareness of some of the political, historical and colonial grounds in which this research sits, for the purpose of this inquiry I will focus on the temporality of what is discussed in the text. Each temporal moment has its own symbolic interactions; the presence of temporary symbols contributes to the way in which cultural hybridity (the negotiation of cultural difference) emerges in a given (enunciated) moment. It is important not to assume and as a consequence assign deeper meaning or definite interpretations to a symbol within each articulation. Rather than offering an interpreted meaning that assumes what De Heer or Hohnen *did* or *thought*, I stay focused on what they say and how this helps me to mobilise the theories of post-colonialism and border crossing pedagogy. Staying focused on what is documented and using segments of text from the reflective outputs enables me to think about the theories and concepts formalised in other research. This assists me to avoid applying fixed interpretations of cultural identity and intercultural encounters and interactions, ensuring I do not delve too deep into what is articulated (but not really there). I now turn to an explanation of Bhabha's (1994) notion of "the enunciative position" of cultural studies and introduce the concept of splitting the subject. Both concepts will be used as an analytical framework in the analysis.

Postcolonial theory challenges people to deconstruct their ideological and traditional views of people who are culturally and linguistically different from themselves in order to negotiate a space where focus can maintain on the processes of intercultural collaboration. Bhabha (1994) explains that it is in the processes of coming together in

a territory of difference that actions and ways of being, shared visions, values and the multiple subjectivities can then be revealed and conveyed. Bhabha (1994) claims that "the enunciative position of contemporary cultural studies is both complex and problematic" (p. 252), often bound by misrepresentations of findings and theories. He asserts that the 'signs' that bind people, that describe histories and identities are so vast and varied and often create "incompatible systems of signification" (p. 252). When exploring the intercultural space of collaboration, 'differences' that exist within a 'liminal space' (third-space location) emerge and are made visible. The liminal space is a place where people encounter each other and "open up the possibilities of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 5). Cultural hybridity refers to the way we critique our own behaviors and those of others in order to produce a meaningful way of behaving together. Hybridity is a conceptualization of the intercultural. It is the "the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *inbetween* space" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 56). Although people may enter this location with their individual identities, it is an opportunity to negotiate a way of being grounded in the present experience, multiple agents of subjectivity and shared imaginings for the future, while maintaining an awareness of the history that shapes the relation.

Bhahba (1994) refers to articulations of cultural hybridity as 'enunciations'. While binary accounts often present a clear-cut representation of the subject/object, enunciations provide "social imagery" that encourage and enable people to see a cultural experience as emergent only when different identities and agencies meet. This is post-colonialism "beyond theory" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 257); the happenings only happen in the performative space of the actual intercultural encounter. Bhabha (1994) suggests the enunciative process must "introduce a split in the performative present of cultural identification" (p. 52)—the splitting of the subject. It is my intention to refrain from recreating the reflective outputs (text as data) as "transparent realities of empiricism" (p. 257). Rather than searching deep into the reflective outputs (texts) to bear defensible representations of intercultural collaboration, I will maintain focus on the surface to explore the multiple forces working together in an in-between location. I will attempt to 'split' the assumed subject/s of De Heer and Hohnen into the multiplicities that exist in moments of human and social encounter.

The theoretical concepts used for analysis, in particular 'enunciation', 'cultural hybridity', 'temporal moments' and 'symbolic interaction' will be further explained in Chapter 4, Research Method. Each moment (conceived through articulations of cultural memory in the reflective outputs) (De Heer, 2007; Hohnen & Pittman, 2011) of intercultural collaboration is considered and read as a metaphorical enunciation of third space cultural hybridity within a "site of political agency" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 11). Postcolonial perspectives and discourses intervene in the "unequal and uneven forces of cultural representation involved in the contest for political and social authority within the modern world order" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 245). Relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are bound by power and the opposing knowledge systems. Postcolonial theories and decolonized discourses will assist in guiding the endeavors of this research, as I attempt to explore whether elements of critical pedagogy can be identified through reflections of intercultural collaboration, from my own subjective perspective. The reflective outputs used in the analysis were *not* produced for the purpose of this research therefore participants were neither invited nor provoked to interrogate the concepts of power and knowledge. The reflective outputs were both constructed based on other projects and initiatives that invited the articulation of intercultural collaborative experiences. Again, I have applied my own subjective reading to the outputs. This will be further discussed in Chapter Four when I explain the method of the analytical processes.

The following section, 3.5, discusses in a more elaborate detail the theoretical concepts of border crossing pedagogy, which is used in tie with Bhabha's (1994) post-colonial theories.

3.5 BORDER CROSSING: MAKING CONNECTIONS WITH THE 'POSTS'

Giroux (2005) concedes that the foundation of his text *'Border Crossings'* engages with the complex theories of the 'posts', that seek to "reclaim the importance of culture, language, discourse, difference, agency, power and politics" (p. 1) in an attempt to revise the 'interface' of politics and pedagogy in educational sites of ideological and cultural practices. Border Crossings provides a theoretical frame that enables reinforcement for the 'location' of my research. I apply this theory alongside

post-colonialism, as explored in Section 3.4, to the context of intercultural collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. It is important to reiterate that Henry Giroux is a white American male and therefore his theoretical conceptions are from this subjective standpoint.

As border crossers, collaborators enter a 'third space' location where cultural differences can be acknowledged, communicated and reflected upon through cultural memory (Bhabha, 1994). Border crossing provides an opportunity for collaborators to engage beyond cultural and ideological boundaries to negotiate how different identities work together. As I explore the complex location beyond cultural borders within a third space, I am aware of different identities, subjectivities, experiences, pedagogical and ideological ways of being across ever evolving contexts (Giroux, 2005) that emerge as symbolic interactions in each temporal moment (Bhabha, 1994). This location cannot be fixed to a totalizing definition or legitimated through the discourse I create. Through engagement in both postcolonial theory and the critical theories of border crossing, I have a growing awareness of not only how complex and political the intercultural space is, but the damaging effects of concepts such as language, difference and culture have been (and often continue to be) represented in discourse. Therefore, I have engaged with elements of border crossing not only for theoretical grounding and an increased and critical understanding of the cultural interface, but to inform and guide my own pedagogical practice of creating discourse.

Giroux (2005) refers to a 'border pedagogy' when discussing the concept of critical pedagogues, from dominant social groups developing a greater understanding of their own positioning within a different cultural space, especially with regard to their relationship with people from marginalised groups. Border pedagogues—educators, progressives, artists, academics, cultural workers and others within sites of social institutions and practices (Giroux, 2005)—critically reflect on the traditional views of community, language, space and possibility and respect the "notion of difference as part of a common struggle to extend and transform" (Giroux, 2005, p. 107). At the interface of intercultural collaboration, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are working towards a deeper understanding of the complexities 'difference' carries. Martin Nakata (2011) concedes that the 'cultural interface' should be a place with "much more room and less prescription" (p. 7). The difference in *meaning* between

two knowledge systems, although important, should not be the primary focus, especially when considering intercultural collaboration generally without a specific partnership or location in mind. Nakata (2011) insists that there is acknowledgement of the "disruptions, discontinuities, continuities and convergences of knowledge in this space and an appreciation of the complexities that exist there" (p. 7). This recognition assumes the "presence of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous standpoints" (p. 7).

Collaborators, as border crossers, use their power to "cross borders that are culturally strange to them" (Giroux, 2005, p. 141) in order to gain a developing understanding of how they are associated within the cultural sphere of others. Critical attention and reflection on such a relationship may assist people to critically analyse the "political and social lineaments of their own values and voices as viewed from different ideological and cultural spaces" (Giroux, 2005, p. 113) and to move beyond the centre of their epistemological groundings. Without intending to generalise, I acknowledge the constant critical reflexivity Indigenous peoples are forced to live through due to being outsiders in many mainstream forums. I do not intend to claim that 'border crossing' is a 'new' concept due to the rise of non-Indigenous peoples concerned with this practice. Intercultural collaboration is a privileged opportunity for non-Indigenous people to embrace the concepts of 'border crossing'. Non-Indigenous collaborators (as critical border pedagogues) "locate themselves in history and become subjects in the construction of their identities and the wider society" (Giroux, 2005, p. 109) in the third space of cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994).

Giroux (2005) emphasizes the "need for people to take up culture as a vital source for developing a politics of identity, community and pedagogy" (p. 24). As noted in the Literature Review, I embrace an understanding of 'culture' as an ever evolving, undefinable concept that relates to the concerns addressed in border pedagogy. When engaging in intercultural collaboration, 'culture' as it pertains to the individual identities and locations of those involved in unique intercultural situations, should be considered and analysed. Giroux (2005) concedes that a more constructive critical pedagogy not only acknowledges the differences that exist in intercultural contexts—*history, language, experiences, voices, power, and privilege*—but goes beyond concerns of difference to find deeper meaning and reveal different ways dominant ideologies (subconsciously or otherwise) invade and contradict lived experiences.

When working, living, creating in an intercultural context, the attempt to translate from one culture to another is an important element in negotiating differences. It is when collaborators make this attempt to go beyond the 'borders', opportunities are created to not only name the differences but see, contemplate and engage in processes of collaboration with heightened awareness of dominant cultural forms and practices. Section 3.6 concludes this chapter with a discussion addressing how the learning from this research project has been constructed as discourse.

3.6 DISCOURSE TO SHARE THE LEARNING

The theoretical groundings of post-colonialism and border crossing pedagogy enable me to carefully consider the role of language with its relationship with power and knowledge. Post-colonial theory emphasises the "temporal dimension" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 53) of the cultural memory, assisting me to see how each articulated moment of intercultural interaction and collaboration (from one subjective perspective) can be 'split' into multiple layers of subjectivity revealing the symbolic interaction (Bhabha, 1994). The elements of post-colonial theory encourage me to demonstrate ambivalence in my attitude towards the interpretation of 'data' and challenge me to refrain from representing fixed notions of intercultural collaboration based purely on the reflective outputs. Border crossing pedagogy draws my attention to the borders of difference and the ever-evolving dynamics of social, political and cultural power that exists there. Border crossing 'pedagogy' has been used to guide this inquiry through the complex sites of intercultural collaboration and also challenge the way in which I, as a non-Indigenous researcher, inform my own pedagogical practice in the creation and construction of this thesis. Both theories inspire a methodological practice that maintains focus on the ontology of "political and heuristic metaphors" (Giroux, 2005, p. 1) that provide "continual and crucial referent for understanding the co-mingling—sometime clash—of multiple cultures, languages, literacies, histories, sexualities and identities" (Giroux, 2005, p. 2).

Shi-Xu (2010) states that much of the discourses and discussions of modern times are still characterised by a 'cultural-other' positioning from a Western/ European viewpoint, where the focus is on 'we/they' or 'us/them'. A deepened awareness of one's social and relational positioning within an intercultural context increases the

ability to critically engage in discussions whereby race and power can be rethought and reconstructed as political narratives, providing alternative discourse that challenges the binary (Giroux, 2005). Giroux (2005) refers to this as 'coming to voice'. The rigorous discussion, from both Indigenous and non-Indigenous standpoints, has the potential to reveal how our beliefs and understandings about race have different historical and ideological underpinnings. This inquiry is particularly concerned with not only developing a deeper understanding of the multiple complexities that prevail within different intercultural encounters, but how I subjectively record and convey these complexities and practical experiences in this thesis. Giroux (2005) draws on postcolonial theory as he addresses the power of language in its construction as discourse. He concedes that language is often "produced and rewritten within the ideological and material legacies of imperialism and colonialism" (p. 11). Post-colonialism challenges the discourses within the domain of democracy, cultural difference and critical pedagogy that are constructed through "master narratives and totalising systems" (Giroux, 2005, p. 12) and consequently promotes the pedagogical problem of creating binary oppositions. Post-colonialism, with support from border crossing, helps to generate new pedagogical strategies and social movements that promote and acknowledge difference without reinscribing the imperialistic methods of dominant subjects. Giroux (2005) concedes the importance of seeing the relationship between language (the way it is constructed as discourse), and knowledge and power.

As I have entered a space that takes up "the language of difference and a concern with politics of the other" (Giroux, 2005, p. 12), it is crucial that I do not reinscribe the imperialistic tendencies of my colonial groundings. In addressing the politics and pedagogy within intercultural moments of collaboration, it is important to avoid "erasing the complexity, complicity, diverse agents and multiple situations" (p. 13) through the construction of binaries that will maintain control and power over the human subjects.

The construction of 'master narratives' would entail applying my subjective assumptions and deep interpretations not only to an unfamiliar context and unfamiliar participants but to moments of social and cultural practice that are always in the beyond. Furthermore I risk reproducing a "reductionist "us" against "them" discourse" (Giroux, 2005, p. 16). As addressed earlier in Section 3.4.1, neither Giroux (2005) nor

Bhabha (1994) formally enter into discussion of materiality and the subjectivity of non-human agency. However, I draw on their abstract concepts of 'location' (third space and within borders of cultural difference), my own awareness of the subjective influence of non-human agency in moments of social interaction and more specifically when considering intercultural relations, the extensive literature and oral narratives that document Indigenous peoples' connection to non-human Entity. Post-colonial theory and border crossing provides a 'location'—third space / cultural borders—where I can address the "construction of new identities, zones of cultural difference, and forms of ethical address that allow cultural workers and educators alike to transform the language, social practice, and histories that are part of the colonial inheritance" (Giroux, 2005, p. 19). Both of these theories enable me to critically think and reflect on the negotiations of difference at and within borders of intercultural interaction and collaboration. As such, I embrace a methodological approach that supports me to mobilise the theories through the enunciations of border crossing in the third space and subsequently consider the processes of intercultural collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

Chapter Five, Research Methods, formally introduces the methodological groundings of this research project. Aligning the ontology and epistemology of the theoretical framework and the methodology was an important consideration for the final analysis and construction of this discourse. As addressed in Section 2.5 of the Literature Review, St. Pierre (2014) emphasises how often, qualitative methodologies ignore the ontological ways of being and rather focus on the epistemological ways of knowing, in determination to produce new knowledge. I engage with the ontology and epistemology of post-qualitative inquires which supports and strengthens the theoretical conceptualisation discussed in this chapter. The following chapter explains the research methods used to address the overarching question of this research project—*what intercultural interactions and processes are evidence in reflective outputs of intercultural collaboration and negotiation?* The theories and the methodology guide my research methods in the analysis of the enunciations of cultural hybridity in order to reveal moments of cultural negotiation and translation in articulated moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. Therefore both will be relevant in the explanation of the research design, which will outline how I intend to analyse the reflective outputs.

Chapter 4: Research Methods

4.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH METHODS

The overarching aim of this research as articulated in Chapter One is to explore the negotiation of cultural difference in articulated moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. Furthermore, I aim to ensure the construction of this dissertation (the interpretation and analysis of the moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration) is conveyed (and consequently conceived) as subjective, hybrid and produced in emerging moments in the performative location of third space hybridity and border pedagogy. The sections in 4.2 discuss post-qualitative inquiry and how I relate it to the theories I have chosen. Section 4.3 reintroduces the reflective outputs used for analysis and section 4.4 illustrates the different research methods I use for the purpose of analysis.

In the data analysis chapter, the ontological and epistemological foundations of this work are constructed within a critical theory paradigm and explored and analyzed through a postcolonial lens. The two publicly available reflective outputs have been explored within a post-qualitative interpretation, using elements of border crossing (as pedagogical practice) and enunciations of cultural hybridity (how the encounter is articulated) in the third space (temporal location of intercultural collaboration). This research sought out publicly-available documented experiences of intercultural collaboration to open up critical investigation into border pedagogy and post-colonialism and how these theories can be mobilized through pedagogical processes of intercultural interactions and collaborations. Two publicly available documents were chosen and I refer to these in their entirety as reflective outputs. The first is a reflective narrative written by film director Rolf De Heer (2007), "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects" and the second is a transcript documenting an interview between Michael Hohnen and Patrick Pittman (2011), titled "Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators". The readings and subsequent analysis of the reflective outputs focus on the praxis of intercultural interactions and collaboration (the processes: actions and reflections, in and upon the individual moments of cultural encounters and negotiation). The interpretations sought to identify whether the

reflective outputs provided opportunity to imagine, bear witness to and rethink issues of difference and negotiation within intercultural collaborations and encounters, put another way the interpretations sought to identify whether the two reflective outputs provided insight into processes and structures of collaborative endeavors using the theoretical framework. Embracing the chance to share experiences of intercultural collaboration provides opportunities for people (border pedagogues) to create a discourse of difference and acknowledge the often-silenced dialogue (Worby Et al. 2011) of Australia's colonial history. Furthermore it is an opportunity to explore and illustrate cultural encounters as not only a challenged space and a "site of struggle" (Giroux, 2005, pg.141) but a place of transformation. Giroux (2005) asserts that while postcolonial discourses open up a forum to explore cultural difference, they also inspire "forms of ethical address that allow cultural workers and educators alike to transform the languages, social practices and histories that are part of the colonial inheritance" (p. 20). Therefore I have engaged with postcolonial ontologies as a process to guide the construction of this research.

Before continuing, it is important that I acknowledge that engaging with the origins of postcolonial theory is a contested space for a non-Indigenous person and a recipient of the cultural and linguistic privileges acquired through the colonizing forces of my ancestors. The assertion from Jackie Huggins as quoted in Probyn (2004): "You were and still are a part of that colonizing force" (Probyn, 2004, para. 8) resonates and is understood that ongoing critical reflection of the effects of colonialism is essential. Postcolonial writing has the power to challenge the problematic theories and writings of binary logic and will assist in guiding critical interpretations and critique of the reflective outputs. While it contains the risk of subconsciously re-inscribing the concerns described, the intention of embracing a postcolonial positioning enhances awareness and understanding of the relational dynamics between colonized/colonizer. This research denotes a responsibility to engage in the imaginings of post-colonialism through exploring the subjective reflections on collaborative endeavors. Postcolonial theory is an important element in raising my critical consciousness and will to be part of a decolonizing force, challenging the imperialistic ideologies that can be found in binary and totalizing Western constructs.

Examples of post-qualitative research have been engaged with to support and inspire the development of the methodological underpinnings. First I will explain my understanding of post-qualitative research in Section 4.2 before justifying my use of it and how I intend to engage with it methodologically. The following section gives an overview of post-qualitative research.

4.2 POST-QUALITATIVE INQUIRY

4.2.1 The Ontological Turn toward Post-qualitative Inquiry

In Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre's (2014) "Brief and personal history of post-qualitative research", she outlines some of the contradictory factors of qualitative research. She concedes that the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of humanist qualitative methodologies are unthinkable in light of the ontological groundings of the "posts". St. Pierre (2014) emphasises the importance of aligning the epistemological and ontological commitments of chosen theories with the chosen methodological practice. She states that too often researchers bring methodological tradition and structure—such as coding, categorising and representations of knowledge—to the productive "post" theories that challenge and react against the very nature of traditional humanistic research. St. Pierre (2014) encourages qualitative researchers to consider the "impossibility of an intersection between conventional humanist qualitative methodology and "the posts," (p. 3) and engage with the "ontological turn" (p. 3). The 'ontological turn' in post-qualitative inquiry maintains focus on the "ontological, which is too often ignored in the epistemological rage for meaning" (St. Pierre, 2014, p. 3).

Post-qualitative inquiry supports me to reengage with the ontological grounding of the theoretical framework. Thinking and analysing with the theoretical concepts is the crucial process used for this research project. The following section will continue to explore a post-qualitative methodology guided by the ontology of Homi K. Bhahba's (1994) third space enunciations of cultural hybridity. Border crossing theory continues to raise my awareness of the concept of politics and pedagogy "played out as ideological and cultural practices" (Giroux, 2005, p. 1) within sites of intercultural interactions and collaboration.

4.2.2 Ontological and Epistemological: Third Space Enunciations of Cultural Hybridity

Enunciations of intercultural collaboration are inextricably linked to the critical elements of post-qualitative inquiry and provide the ontological grounding for this research. Bhabha (1994) explains that enunciations are the dialogical processes that "alter the subject of culture from an epistemological function to an enunciative practice" (p. 255), displacing the "descriptions of cultural elements as they tend towards a totality" (p. 255). 'Enunciating' the processes of intercultural collaboration, (*beyond* the boundaries of simply identifying differences and creating defensible frameworks to follow), denies "a tradition…a stable system of reference…certitude in the articulation of new cultural demands and meanings" (p. 51). Bhabha (1994) explains that authors of social action—those who choose to document their experiences of 'third space' encounters—are indeed the creators of its "unique meaning" (p. 18), however, authors do not have the authority to "control its outcome" (p. 18). Bhabha (1994) invites authors of social and cultural action to join his mission:

> Our task remains, however, to show how historical agency is transformed through the signifying process; how the historical event is represented in a discourse that is somehow beyond control. (p. 18)

While I am not the author of the reflective outputs, I have analyzed and engaged with them through Bhabha's (1994) ontology. I describe the segments of text taken from the two separate reflective outputs as enunciations as I am aware of the multiple subjectivities that emerge in each moment described and their signification of the cultural, social, linguistic and material as immensurable and temporal (Bhabha, 1994). Treating each enunciation as a 'language metaphor' as opposed to a representation of an actual moment keeps me grounded in my own enunciative response and construction of a discourse that explores intercultural encounters. The two reflective outputs (De Heer, 2007; Hohnen, 2011) in and of themselves are articulations of 'historical' moments (past/cultural memories) that signify processes/moments of intercultural collaboration or interaction. Each moment is read with an awareness of

the multiplicities that emerge in each moment of human action assisting me to avoid constructing "unitary, static, binary, totalizing modes" (Martin & Kamberelis, 2013, p. 670) that suggest that the intercultural space can be 'fixed' or prescribed. For the purpose of this research, the reading and interpretation of the reflective outputs sought to identify how each moment opens up a new and alternative "hybrid sites of cultural negotiation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 255). As I engage with this ontology I am guided in my jurisdictions:

> As literary creatures and political animals we ought to concern ourselves with the understanding of human action and the social world as a moment when something is beyond control, but not beyond accommodation. (Bhabha, 1994, p. 18)

For the purpose of this project, there is no assumed or imposed hierarchy. The material elements, social interaction and cultural signifiers are just as important as the human (De Heer and Hohnen)—the assumed 'subjects' of the discourses. A post-qualitative inquiry guides me to maintain focus on how the text in the reflective outputs assist me to mobilise the theories of postcolonial theory and border pedagogy—both theories deny the reinscribing binary logic of social explanation and fixed representations of culture and identity and maintain focus on "negotiating the complex terrain of anti-colonial enquiry" (Phillips, 2005, p. 1).

The attributes of border crossing pedagogy used in this dissertation provide a catalyst when exploring the political space of intercultural encounters. They are neither 'methods' nor step-by-step procedures that explain *how* and *what* intercultural collaborations should be. The critical attributes of critical consciousness, reflection, dialogue, dissent, difference, power, knowledge etc., cannot be prescribed and applied to individual ways of being. As explored in the theory, a critical pedagogy of border crossing emphasizes the need for people to sustain 'hybrid identities' and embrace cultural differences in order to work through the challenges that arise at and within cultural boundaries. The third space (a site of crossing cultural borders) enables social practices whereby 'meaning' "is re-invented in the body, desire, and in the relations between self and others" (Giroux, 2005, p. 11)—bound by individual grounding in the "political, ethical, economic and social" (p. 11) as well as cultural and material agency. Although Giroux (2005) and Bhabha (1995) do not explicitly focus on the non-human

agency in moments of cultural hybridity and border crossings, I take concepts such as 'location', 'symbolic designation' and 'culture' (in its evolving entirety) to conceive of the non-human elements that are also present and making causal (and temporal) connections in moments of social interaction. Mazzei (2014) stresses that ways of being and knowing are "never done in isolation but always affected by different forces coming together" (p. 743). As I explore moments of intercultural interaction, I maintain awareness that I cannot assume that what is written as text, is essential and stable (Martin & Kamberelis, 2013). When considering the emergent 'symbolic designations' in each documented moment of intercultural interaction (as well as musing the symbolic designations that have been omitted), it is beyond my jurisdiction to apply definitive inferred, critical or categorical meaning.

The following section, 4.2.3, continues to elaborate on post-qualitative inquiry and how its groundings have guided me through the analytical processes. More specifically, how it assists me to acknowledge the multiple subjectivities, both generated by human and non-human agency present in emergent moments of social practice. I will outline and justify how the two reflective outputs will *not* be read and interpreted with reference to other post-qualitative inquires. I then follow on with the ontological and epistemological groundings of the theories with which I have engaged to amplify how their perspectives support and correlate with post-qualitative inquiry and inform the analytical process of this research. This section will also talk about the entanglement of elements that influence human ways of being and denote how they will be contributing in the analytical 'subjective split'.

4.2.3 (Re) deciding on (post) qualitative inquiry: A Move Away From Traditional Analysis and Binary Logic

Post-qualitative inquiry has challenged me to maintain an open and evolving understanding of ontology and in particular challenge the ontological reasoning of humanist qualitative methodologies that aim to generate totalizing theories or knowledge (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013; Rosiek & Heffernan, 2014; Youngblood Jackson, 2013). Youngblood Jackson (2013) explains that often essentialism, an offshoot of humanism, "imposes itself on qualitative methodology by assuming that people who speak give us rational, coherent truths that serve as foundation for data

and analysis" (p. 742). Post-qualitative inquiries can displace seemingly stable human knowledge and experience from the center of an inquiry (Jackson, 2013) and place emphasis on the variety of elements, human and non-human, that pertain to ongoing influence on human ways of being and behaving. The unfolding moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration are becoming, in the beyond and bound both the human and non-human agency. Lather and St.Pierre (2013) challenge me to consider and privilege *being* over *knowing* and explore the entanglement of "language, the human, and the material…completely imbricated on the surface" (p. 630)—as agents that constantly overlap and are "never stable" (p. 630). Similarly, Jackson's (2013) post-humanist analysis which draws on Andrew Pickering's (1993) theory, 'the mangle', enables me to see how human agency is inextricably linked with non-human, material agency. Jackson's (2013) use of post-humanist ontology emphasizes the 'mangle' of material and human elements as always performative and as Pickering states (quoted in Jackson, 2013) "temporally emergent in practice" (p. 743) emphasizing how the non-human is overlooked and refused in humanistic ontology and analysis. My analysis does not draw on theories that reflect deep thought on materiality (something beyond the scope of this inquiry) therefore the discussions in this area lack theoretical rigor. However, maintaining an element of focus on materiality supports me in considering multiple and emerging symbols in the process of intercultural negotiation, rather than solely considering human agency. Humanistic ontology often "assumes depth in which human is superior to and separate from the material" (Lather & St.Pierre, 2013, p. 630). Furthermore and referring once again to St. Pierre (2014), she alerts my attention to and troubles the space of "being there" (p. 11) in reference to personally collecting the 'data', especially considering the discursive materials I am using are publicly available documents. Since engaging with post-qualitative inquiries I have applied progressive thought to the traditional elements of qualitative methodologies that tend to privilege "the origin" (St. Pierre, 2014), as first order and primary, and language and/or discourse ('just text') "as second-order, unreliable, and representational" (St. Pierre, 2014, p. 10). The language/reality binary is another construction that post-qualitative troubles. Post-qualitative inquiries argue against the perception that the "language that matters" is the language that is heard (St.Pierre, 2014, p. 10). For the purpose of this research, I choose not to be concerned by 'the origin'—not collecting my own 'data'. Had I of gone to the 'the origin',

listened to the voices in a temporal and becoming moment (Bhabha, 1994), I would have subsequently turned the 'voices' into words and text anyway.

This particular research project is concerned with not only developing a deeper awareness of the multiple moments of intercultural encounters and the complexities that prevail within different intercultural collaborations, but how these experiences as well as my own analysis are subjectively constructed as discourse. Each reflective output was read a number of times. My initial reaction was to begin 'coding'—identifying common themes throughout each piece and making connections between them all. Categories began to emerge, for example, *communication/ dialogue, challenges, feelings (excitement/frustrations), diverse language and culture, reflections*… The codes and thus categories were relating to varied elements explored in the literature review, elements of critical pedagogy and my own experiences working in intercultural contexts. Initially, this was exciting—the 'data' that I had researched was going to *work.* They were shaping up to have all the required elements for me to prove effective ways of collaborating in an intercultural space. The reflective outputs seemed to provide me with defensible examples of what intercultural collaboration *should* look like and sound like. Furthermore, I had the final products (films/music) as proof that they were 'successful' intercultural collaborations. Consequently, these texts urged me to "attempt to produce order and regularity" (Jackson, 2013, p. 742) and promote them as good, solid 'representations'—something from which 'we' could all learn. I found myself 'speaking for' the human subjects in the text, interpreting and giving my own subjective meanings to what they did or said.

However, there was something unsettling about this process of treating the reflective outputs as "coherent truths that serve as foundation for analysis and interpretation" (Jackson, 2013, p. 742). I found myself questioning what I didn't know. The complexities and questions still existed and the answers were not to be found in the 'data'. While I could identify moments that tended to characteristically reflect examples of intercultural collaboration, I could not foresee how I was going to contain and measure this space in a way that would leave me satisfied. For example, 'engaging in dialogue' is an important attribute in developing relationships but the way individual people go about engaging in dialogue may be subjectively different. People are

subjective and together create hybrid identities. Furthermore, I may consider the end products (films/music) to be successful, however, they are not necessarily a reflection of authentic, respectful collaborative partnerships. I reiterate again, I have only accessed and used the voice of part of each collaborative team.

This process of questioning the methodological groundings as well as the analytical methods for this research has assisted me in developing a greater awareness and respect for how language is constructed in discourse. Furthermore, as I developed my understandings of the theoretical framework, the contradictions St. Pierre (2014) alerts me to, for example paying more attention to ontology of post-colonialism, became apparent. With regard to analysis, Mazzei (2014) notes that a "reading of data *with* theoretical concepts produces an emergent and unpredictable series of readings as data and theory make themselves intelligible to one another" (p. 743). Therefore I revisited the theories and continued to explore the methodological options for this research. Reading and thinking with theory enabled me to mobilise both the theoretical concepts and the reflective outputs. The enunciations enabled me to discuss the 'interstitial intimacies' (moments of negotiation in the third space) (Bhabha, 1994) of the encounters and the deep level thinking that describes phenomena related to intercultural relations. Thinking with theory enabled insight into how they worked together bound by multiple subjectivities. The 'results' and 'analysis' became not about De Heer (2007) or Hohnen (2011) and honoring their transformational experiences (although impressive), but about the cultural hybridity articulated through the discursive measure.

It is important to reiterate that the 'data' used for this project have been referred to as 'reflective outputs'. Svend Brinkmann (2014) questions the notion of 'data' when considering alternative ways to refer to the collecting of and the analytical process. He suggests the etymology of 'data' is "the given" (p. 721). One of the critical elements of post-qualitative methodologies is challenging the humanistic tendencies of certain types of qualitative analyses and their defining conclusions; therefore it would seem contradictory to uphold and refer to the traditional conception of 'data' as *data*. Brinkmann's (2014) acknowledgement encouraged, as the foundation for this inquiry, embracing alternative descriptions of the 'data' used, thus being, reflective outputs. As acknowledged in Section 2.4 of the Literature Review, post-qualitative methodology

does not deny or replace qualitative or quantitative research methods. I also acknowledge that there are different types of qualitative methodologies that do not depend on the method of coding, for example a standard literary textual analysis. One of the distinctive elements of post-qualitative is the process of questioning 'truths' and empirical statements that have potential to frequent research. For the purpose of giving an example, the following section uses coding as an example for comparison.

Youngblood Jackson's (2013) reproach of traditional data analysis in her article *'Posthumanist data analysis of mangling practices'* (explored in Section 2.5), reveals the "humanistic tendencies in coding" (p. 741). Her arguments against humanism explore and thus relate to the representational discourses of those who "set out to formulate clear, rational, principles that could be organized into a system of truths from which accurate information about the world could be deduced" (p. 741). The traditional analytical approach of 'coding' data—sorting, labelling, interpreting, categorizing—is a reflexive and interpretive process between the researcher, the data, literature and the theoretical framework. Data are collected by the researcher for the purpose of finding, observing and then recording particular themes based on patterns in similar data sets (O'Reily, 2009). Lisa Mazzei (2014) cautions the use of coding as analysis as it "requires that researchers pull back from the data in a move that concerns itself with the macro, produce broad categories and themes that are plucked from the data to disassemble and reassemble the narrative to adhere to these categories" (p. 743). Embracing coding, for the purpose of this research, risks reproducing predictable themes and categories that have already been explored and produced as 'knowledge' in alternative inquiries—albeit, those that have somewhat inspired the development of this particular research. Common themes that emerge in the area of intercultural collaboration have been explored in the literature review. This is not to say that all literature in Chapter Two used coding as analytical method. However, many pertain to strategies or methods that outline how non-Indigenous people *should* or *have* entered into an intercultural space, for example, engaging in dialogue, listening to the stories and convictions of Indigenous peoples in localized contexts, building strong and reciprocal relationships with community; others discuss the effects of initiatives grounded in Western ideology and partnerships bound by inequalities, power and control or the 'outcomes' of collaborative projects. Most agree on the challenges of cultural difference at the boundary of intercultural encounters and insist on the need to

look further within the realm of how those challenges are processed, structured and negotiated.

Jackson and Mazzei (2012) assert that "coding takes us back to what is known, not only to the experience of our participants but also our own experience as well" (p. 12). Therefore, in addition to the themes and categories already acknowledged and published in literary discourse, the *personal* experiences of intercultural collaboration also have the potential to influence the categories and themes formulated, limiting the focus to remain on "fixed recognizable meaning" (Jackson & Mazzei, 2014, p. 12). Finally, the use of codes risks forcing similar instances into the same category. Coding systems and categories tend to be finite allowing little room for things to be 'grey', allowing little room for reading of the 'data' to 'dwell' in areas not yet thought about. Coding data presents researchers with an inclination to talk about what the outcomes of that interaction are/were, rather than describing the problem or the encounter. Coding and placing parts of the text into categories based on what is already known through literature, theory and personal experiences will risk producing an analysis of the cultural differences between the collaborators and/or analyzing the human action and consequently promoting an essential subject—the human subject and De Heer's (2007) or Hohnen's (2011) experiences. For the purpose of this inquiry coding has the potential to increase the risk of producing a representation—telling it "like is really is out there in rich, thick description" (Lather & St.Pierre, 2013). Coding also risks maintaining focus on the humanistic tendencies of individuals who have shared their thinking and reflections on intercultural interactions and collaborations. A representation suggests 'knowing'. I come back to the complex space of 'culture' and intercultural encounters to assist my understanding of the many things, both human and non-human that are unthinkable within this space, beyond my knowing, therefore unable to be represented.

St. Pierre (2014) states that to avoid humanist methods and structures, post-qualitative researchers should use the "analysis provided by the 'posts' to think about what puzzles them" (p. 3). St. Pierre uses "concept as method" (p. 7) in order to slow down the analytical process, reorientate thinking and engage with the puzzles and questions offered by post-theorists. This research methodology engages with concepts drawn from 'post'colonial theory and border crossing pedagogy. As explored in Chapter

Three Section 3.4.1, a postcolonial theoretical "perspective resists the attempts at holistic forms of social explanation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 248). Border crossing pedagogy is inextricably linked with the elements of 'post' theories, in that it asserts that "master narratives based on white, patriarchal, and class-specific versions of the world can be challenged critically and effectively deterritorialized" (Giroux, 2005, p. 24). Border crossing pedagogy challenges the fixed conceptualisations of 'culture' that are 'represented' in discourses as objective and definite. Especially discourses that have attempted to 'represent' the epistemology and ontology of Indigenous peoples through the subjective positioning of Western viewpoint.

For these reasons I think with theory and "working the limits" (Mazzei, 2014, p. 743) rather than the limitations of coding (Mazzei, 2014). Thinking with theory allows me to engage with segments of the reflective outputs with the key elements of the theoretical frame. A back and forth referral to the ontologies of post-colonial theory fused with the critical attributes of border crossing pedagogy supports a less linear, more circular interpretation of the reflective outputs.

4.2.4 Enunciations of Cultural Hybridity: Discourse of Difference

As explained in Chapter Three, there is a shared consensus between many who recognize the challenges and complexities of cultural encounters. Furthermore, critical importance is placed on articulating and theorizing the differences between knowledge systems. While these discourses contribute greatly to the field of intercultural inquiry, it is often generated through binary logic that eludes particular complexities of working towards a convergence of difference in intercultural collaborations. In discourse that explicates cultural encounters, there are common tendencies to describe "the effect rather than the structure of the problem" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 50). Cultural encounters, where 'differences' are united through unique and diverse processes are rarely explored or theorized beyond the boundaries of difference (Bhabha, 1994; Giroux, 2005). This research searches for and explores enunciations of cultural difference through discourses that articulate social action through forms of intercultural encounters with the core intention of collaboration and negotiating how to work together. "Beyond control, but not beyond accommodation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 18) refers to the *inbetween* space where the production of enunciations that fuse cultural

relations of difference, can take "measure of its dwelling" (p. 18). Images, symbols, descriptions of cultural hybridity are produced to conceptualize the individual moments of an intercultural relationship whereby differences are *accommodated* and negotiated, challenged and critiqued, rather than controlled. Bhabha's (1994) notion of 'dwelling' and to 'dwell' can be interpreted and used in different ways. For the purpose of this inquiry, the following meanings have been applied to interpretations. 'Dwelling' is "a house, flat or other place of residence", enabling me to consider 'the location'—the third space, the place of intercultural collaboration. To 'dwell *on (or upon)*' is "to linger over, emphasize, or ponder in thought, speech or writing", enabling me to 'trouble' the enunciations, engage with the entanglement of various material, social and cultural agency embedded in each momentary location. To '*dwell in*' is "to live or continue in a given condition or state" enables the time, energy, patience given to accommodate and negotiate the intercultural relationship.

When documenting experiences of intercultural collaboration as reflective outputs, the accounts can be represented in various forms of discourse. The various reflections of intercultural collaboration found in the reflective outputs have been interpreted based on their significance toward enunciations of cultural hybridity. The interpretations capture the moments that theoretically ascribe to the discursive practice of critical border pedagogy and articulations of cultural hybridity. How the authors and creators of the reflective outputs have used the opportunity to engage in the political realm and acknowledgement of colonial relations has also been deliberated.

The notion of 'border crossing' will serve to explore how the actions and reflections during and after intercultural collaboration have potential to provide a discourse that illustrates transformation between relations of power as well as subjective consciousness. The critical characteristics of 'border crossing' support the theoretical underpinning of postcolonial theory that challenges binary oppositions and imperial constructions of discourse that project universal claims. Although postcolonial theory does not provide a particular methodological tool for analysis, its concerns with concepts of identity, cultural difference and how 'differences' are united, are critical elements when exploring the multiplicity of identities being constructed and restructured in intercultural collaboration. Postcolonial theory provides insight on the

use and construct of oppositional language, practice and discourse, and makes visible elements of dominant discourse that can implicitly contradict its own trajectories, with binary and totalizing narratives. This research project intends to 'imbricate' the assumed 'essential' subject of human as overlapping and always becoming with the multiple subjectivities that exist and influence human agency. I subjectively 'split' the human subject (De Heer and Hohnen) into the 'symbolic interactions' (Bhabha, 1994), such as location, material elements and social and cultural action and difference, enabling me to see how they are inextricably linked and work together in the processes of intercultural encounter, enabling moments of cultural hybridity and negotiations of difference.

The following section, 4.3, reintroduces the two reflective outputs—Rolf De Heer's (2007) "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects", and Michael Hohnen and Patrick Pittman's (2011) interview transcript.

4.3 INTRODUCING THE REFLECTIVE OUTPUTS

Two reflective outputs are used for this dissertation to explore negotiations of cultural difference through articulated moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. As briefly explained in Section 1.4 in Chapter One, the first reflective output is a personal reflection from film director Rolf De Heer (2007) narrating his relationship and interaction with various significant people involved in multiple film projects he has directed. The second reflective output is a transcript that illustrates moments of musical collaboration between Geoffrey Gurrumul Yunupingu and Michael Hohnen. Rolf De Heer and Michael Hohnen are non-Aboriginal men, working collaboratively with Aboriginal people, on Aboriginal land, in a society conflicted by Western ideologies. The two separate partnerships have evolved in similar environmental contexts and pedagogical paradigms. This research engages with the stories told by De Heer (2007) and Hohnen (2011) based on their experiences in intercultural contexts. Their 'words' as reflective outputs inspire me to think about the theories that conceptualise negotiations of pedagogical practice at and within the borders of cultural difference. De Heer (2007) and Hohnen (2011) are the primary voice of the respective texts. One could assume they are the protagonists, dominating the majority of the

discourse with their reflections and responses—their reflections are subjective as is my reading of them.

Rolf De Heer (2007) and Michael Hohnen (2011) describe their experiences working collaboratively with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples over the past 10—20 years. Although the locational contexts and professional realms are similar, the two men have used different ways of reflecting on their different intercultural collaborations. While the focus of this research is not on the projects produced through the collaborations, both men and their collaborative counterparts are inextricably linked to nationally and internationally acclaimed projects. The analysis and interpretation through the theories of post-colonialism and critical pedagogy maintain on enunciations that reveal the processes of negotiation during collaboration. The outputs have been used to link theory and practice, endeavoring to gain insight into one of many pathways that re/envision the relationship between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia. Different moments of praxis (actions and reflection) based on the intercultural encounters and collaborations are described throughout each reflective output. The participants do not claim that the reflections or conversations are 'critical'; however, critical elements throughout the discourse will be identified and discussed. Also, as mentioned in Chapter One Section 1.3, the data was not personally collected (due to the ethical concerns) therefore there was no encouragement or specific conversation about the purpose of this research—the focus or the theories used—eliminating any notion of coercing the discussion to appropriate the research inquiry. The next two sub-sections (4.3.1 and 4.3.2) will describe the two reflective outputs.

4.3.1 Reflective Output One

When Rolf De Heer co-directed the film *Ten Canoes* (2006) with Yolngu man Peter Djigirr, he was concerned with and aware of how Whiteness has been deeply embedded in films that tell Indigenous stories (2007). He knew that to successfully work with Indigenous communities, he would need to throw "off the shackles" of his "white privileged existence and approach things in a manner consistent with their way of doing things" (2007, para.9). He needed to learn ways to behave within a foreign culture. The film *Ten Canoes* won six Australian Film Industry awards and has several

awards at international film festivals. More importantly, this collaborative and respectful partnership between De Heer and the Yolngu people of Ramingining, gave ownership of an internationally acclaimed project to Yolngu people and allowed them to tell their story, in their language, through traditional practice, on their ancestral land. Rolf De Heer (2007), published a reflective narrative titled "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects", in an edition of the Australian Humanities Review, 2007. '*The Australian Humanities Review'* is an electronically available journal providing an intellectual forum for discussions and debate based in humanities disciplines, in particular the areas of gender, cultural and media studies, politics, sociology and anthropology (2007). The main section of this particular edition of the electronic journal (featuring De Heer's personal reflection), is titled "Approaching Whiteness". The edition (edited by Fiona Probyn-Rapsey and Anne Brewster) comprises seven essays and interviews that provide a medium for its audience to engage with different conceptualizations of Whiteness, grounded in different Australian contexts and relating to race, specifically in relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia.

Based on what he nominates as "instinctive and unconscious" (2007, para.1), De Heer articulates his evolving 'ways of being' when working in an intercultural context. His audience is taken on a short journey over a ten-year span that describes his experiences as a film director concerned with the creation of films that tell Indigenous stories and contain Indigenous themes. His reflections articulate what he remembers about the cultural and social encounters as well as his reflections and wonderings (at the time) providing a historical and personal account into the praxis of the intercultural encounters from his perspective. Rolf De Heer is often reviewed and critiqued not only for his professional and creative expression and expertise as a film director, but for the dedication he displays towards the importance of collaboration and creating mutually respectful and negotiated partnerships. De Heer has produced and published several discourses where he openly interrogates and critiques the positioning of race relations in the construction and creation of projects concerning intercultural collaboration. For example, the documentary *Balanda and the Bark Canoe—The Making of Ten Canoes* (2006), a media documentation primarily dedicated to the cultural translation and negotiation between *Balanda* (white person) and *Yolngu* (Aboriginal person) people and knowledge systems. What attracts me to these discourses is how De Heer, as a

non-Indigenous man engages with the opportunity to explicate his professional experiences and success (as film director) through a forum that addresses the social, cultural and historical inequities (and the subsequent exploitation that frequently occurs) in contexts that involve and concern Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia. Furthermore he shares personal acknowledgement of the contested and challenging nature of working in this context. The reflective output, "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects" (2007) provides opportunity to explore his experiences of different collaborative processes and interactions through his subjective perspective. This reflective output in its entirety is a 4,596-word reflection. Three segments, which I have named 'enunciations' (articulations of cultural hybridity—how people negotiate difference in temporal moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration), have been selected from the reflective output. The second reflective output, explained in 4.3.2, is the interview transcript between musician and manager Michael Hohnen and journalist Patrick Pittman (2011).

4.3.2 Reflective output Two

Geoffrey Gurrumul Yunupingu, hailed musician from Galiwinku (Elcho Island), North East Arnhem Land and Michael Hohnen, long time musician and co-director of Skinnyfish Music, are creative collaborators. There are many reflective outputs that promote the partnership and collaborative endeavors and successes of Michael Hohnen and Geoffrey Gurrumul Yunupingu. Gurrumul often appearing in media productions —magazines, newspapers, concert advertisements, television performances, and social media—however, it is widely known that Gurrumul won't 'do' interviews (2011). Friend and musical collaborator Michael Hohnen embraces the role of Gurrumul's spokesperson. The second reflective output used in this inquiry is an interview transcript documenting the dialogical encounter between Michael Hohnen and Patrick Pittman (2011). Interviewer Patrick Pittman (2011) describes the partnership between Hohnen and Gurrumul as he watches them play… "I get it. I feel it. Collaboration, the kind that connects people several layers deep. I am transfixed" (para.2).

Michael Hohnen reflects on several experiences working with Gurrumul with Pittman, a writer, editor and radio broadcaster "who loves pushing magazines to feature more

about development politics" (Peard, 2013, para. 1). The initial readings of the interview transcript ignored (subconsciously or otherwise) Patrick Pittman's questions, maintaining focus on Hohnen's articulations of his intercultural collaboration with Gurrumul—he *was*, after all the original subject. However, in becoming more familiar with the theoretical and methodological ontologies of this research—amongst Hohnen's responses, elements of critical border pedagogy and metaphorical musings of post-colonialism (cultural hybridity in the third space) emerged in Pittman's wonderings as undeniably part of the entanglement. A more thorough reading of the interview questions, assisted in interpreting where Pittman potentially wanted the discussion to go, revealing attributes connected to the types of post-colonial discourse produced by an author of social action in the third space. His inquiries demonstrated elements of critical consciousness as they related to notions of political action and an awareness of power and knowledge constructs in intercultural relations.

Dumbo Feather is published quarterly—both on the internet and as a hard copy magazine. Each edition contains five profiles explicating the stories of people across different vocational contexts, for example education, science, fashion and the Arts (). The magazine team, claim to appeal to an audience "who want to be inspired and told a different story than the one they hear every day"—a place to exchange, communicate and connect unique ideas and the people behind them (para.2). Reflective output two, "Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators", is documented as discourse in 5,960 words and approximately 26 questions/prompts from Patrick Pittman. For the purpose of analysis for this research, four segments, which I also call 'enunciations', have been selected from reflective output two.

4.4 A HYBRID READING AND HYBRIDITY AS ANALYSIS

4.4.1 A Hybrid Reading the Reflective outputs

Although there were many similarities between DeHeer (2007) and Hohnen's (2011) outputs, they have been kept separate to reflect their unique and individual thoughts at the time of their articulations. Not only are encounters *within* a relationship emergent and beyond definition, it cannot be expected that diverse and separate relationships

negotiate and entangle their practice in the same way. Many facets influence the analysis of reflective outputs: the social/cultural/historical/material locations of each moment, the theoretical framework I have embraced and my own awareness of working in cross-cultural environments (Childers, 2014). Childers (2014) states that the "analysis must respond to the pressing of context of the particular study" (p. 820). While the enunciations from both outputs have been assumed based on the same criteria, they are each deservedly of their own hybrid analysis. Although the two outputs will be considered separately, the analysis will constantly revert back to the same theoretical groundings. A post-qualitative inquiry has led to a hybrid analysis of the reflective outputs. As explored in Section 2.5 of Chapter Two and Section 4.2 of this chapter, post-qualitative scholars provide unique ways of "reading-the-data-while-thinking-the-theory" (Mazzei, 2014, p. 743). 'Plugging in' (Mazzei, 2014), 'mangling practices' (Youngblood Jackson, 2013) and 'mapping not tracing' (Martin & Kamberelis, 2013), are examples of how theoretical concepts have been used to guide the research process. These examples demonstrate alternative ways of mobilizing the theories, making connections and revealing the 'incoherent subjectivity' (Mazzei, 2014) that exists in both becoming moments and within the construction of these moments in discourse. For the purpose of this dissertation, a hybrid analysis enables processes that guide me to 'plug in' (Mazzei, 2014) to a combination of "ideas, theory, selves, sensations" (Mazzei, 2014, p. 743). A theoretical reading of the reflective outputs has assisted in moving the "qualitative analysis away from habitual normative readings (e.g. coding)" (Mazzei, 2014, pg. 742) and allowed a more hybrid and unpredictable arrival of insights in the field of intercultural relations, namely, the entanglement of multiple subjectivities as 'imbricated' agents. When considering 'how' people move in the intercultural space and 'how' cultural differences are negotiated (through the documented reflections and stories) I maintain awareness of the unstable and always becoming nature of social and cultural encounters. I ensure to consider the "agentic assemblage of diverse elements that are constantly intra-acting" (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013, p. 630), always changing and relocating, picking up new meanings as they move. The theories of borders crossing pedagogy and third space cultural hybridity have enabled me to consider critical elements of negotiations of cultural difference. A hybrid reading allows me to read back through different attributes, mobilizing the theory in a hybrid way.

4.4.2 Locating Enunciations: A Hybrid Reading of the Reflective outputs

Through a subjective 'reading of hybridity' of the reflective outputs (based on the notion of cultural hybridity as explained throughout Chapters Three and Four), I came to see moments that not only amplified the difficulties and unsettling of identities in intercultural collaboration, but the negotiated space that allowed collaboration to occur. There were many moments articulated throughout the reflective outputs that pertain to important considerations when exploring the scenes of intercultural collaboration. However, for the purpose of this research I have selected moments that inherently focus on intercultural encounters and interactions. The use of hybridity as an analytical method (delving in and out of the theoretical frame as the words in the enunciations remind me of particular elements) assisted me to locate sections of the reflective outputs that trouble the space of intercultural encounters.

Cultural hybridity "problematizes the boundaries but does not erase them" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 16). 'Hybridity', drawing on a mixture of different theoretical elements and concepts, has enabled me to select segments that inform me of the difficulties of living, working and creating in a space bound by cultural differences that challenge the cultural binary logic of us/them and provide snapshots of moments of togetherness. Throughout the analysis I will refer to these selected segments as 'enunciations'. For the purpose of this research, the meaning of 'enunciation' draws on elements of the dialogical processes described by Bhabha (1994). As explored in Chapter Three, an enunciation challenges the "rationale of the hegemonic moment and relocating alternative, hybrid sites of cultural negotiation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 255). I use the words of De Heer (2007) and Hohnen (2011) to offer theorisations of cultural hybridity and border crossing pedagogy in an attempt to reveal negotiations of cultural difference. I do not establish an interpretation of their actions and thinking. I think with theory as I read the enunciations with the concept of 'hybridity' as analytical process. I used the text in the enunciations to "enable rather than represent being" (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 652) and to articulate how they inspire continuous questioning disrupting "settled places" (Lather, 2013, p. 642) in my work and understandings. Lisa A. Mazzei (2014) assists me in a deeper awareness that "knowing is never done in isolation but is always affected by different forces coming together" (p. 743). Mazzie (2014) uses a 'diffractive analysis' to "plug into multiple texts" (p. 743) in order to disrupt and deny

the categories inherent in coding. The analysis of the selected enunciations drew on the variety of texts and theories as a way of "making new connectives" (Mazzei, 2014, p. 743) and deepening an awareness of the entanglement of different identities intertwined within a social and material world.

In and of themselves, the reflective outputs do not inherently claim to be enunciations of third space hybridity. Nor do they claim to be representations of *how* to engage in critical pedagogical practice at and within the borders of cultural difference. Furthermore, answers and overarching solutions to cultural difference at the unique sites of intercultural collaboration will not be found in the reflective outputs. They do, however, provide discourses that make me respond to the critical elements of border crossing pedagogy and cultural hybridity. They enable thoughts of cultural hybridity —ways of being in an intercultural space. The reflective outputs assist in considering the purpose and importance of cultural negotiation and translation at and within borders of cultural difference and how the processes of collaboration are already happening, yet always in the beyond and always subjectively split. What happens 'next' is unknown and based on ongoing and ever-changing intuition. The reflective outputs provide insight into how the men respond and react in processes of collaboration and how the partnerships are bound by relational negotiation and the materiality and sociality of cultural difference and the creative projects they work on together.

While De Heer's (2007) and Hohnen's (2011) separate reflections provide social imagery of intercultural encounters and collaboration, they are based on a single, temporal moment and articulation in time and as a consequence place me in a "limit situation" (Mazzei, 2013, p. 642). It is important that I do not assume that De Heer (2007) and Hohnen (2011) (influenced by many subjectivities) have given me (the researcher—also bound with much subjectivity) "rational, coherent truths that serve as foundation ('data') for analysis and interpretation" (Jackson, 2013, p. 742). Although it would not be difficult to translate or reduce (Selby, 2004) De Heer's (2007) and Hohnen's (2011) separate accounts (assume meanings and apply depth), in order to uphold a post-qualitative methodological approach I will stay within the limits of the text. I am aware that should I "stabilize essence" (Jackson, 2013, p. 742) in an attempt to produce order, regularity and make fixed meaning, I will risk denying difference

and as a result privilege the identity of De Heer (2007) and Hohnen (2011) (Jackson, 2013). The analysis will neither represent fixed cultural differences or identities, nor will it represent a defensible model of intercultural collaboration. I will maintain focus on the moments that enable me to consider the negotiation of cultural difference at and within the borders of a third space location. The enunciations allow me to focus on different moments of intercultural interaction and think creatively about how they reveal moments of negotiation of cultural difference. They do not, however, provide a contingency or calculable to be applied to a mastery conceptualisation of what they did, how they did with the intention of creating order and method in an unmeasurable space. It is important to reiterate that the enunciations can "be relived from differing subject positions" (Lather, 2013, p. 639) and engaged with through differing theoretical frameworks, therefore re-presented and read anew. The following section provides an outline of the analytical process.

4.4.3 Demonstration of Analysis

Chapter Five will present a hybrid analysis of the enunciations (articulated moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration) selected from the reflective outputs presented in Appendix A and Appendix B. I have used theoretical conceptualisations as 'process' for analysis. I have used a 'hybrid' reading of the reflective outputs to identify negotiations of difference in order to explore cultural hybridity in the third space. As I read the enunciations selected from the reflective outputs, I delve into different and emerging elements of theory and enunciate (myself) how it enables me to mobilise and reflect upon the interconnected components of the reflective outputs and theoretical concepts. The enunciation will initially be 'split' into the multiple subjectivities that emerge in a given articulated moment, enabling me to consider the multiplicity of elements temporally present in moments of intercultural interaction. Although the formal analysis may not draw on each 'split' subjectivity (identified by me, a subjective player in the analytical process) doing this ('the Split'), emphasizes how this space cannot be stabilized or promoted as essential and universal (Martin & Kamberelis, 2013). This process keeps me grounded in the avoidance of creating representations of how one behaves or rather should behave or 'be' in an intercultural collaborative relationship.

Section 5.2.1 and Section 5.3.1 provide a short introduction for each reflective output, which I call the 'social imagery'. I take a short single enunciation from the beginning of each reflective output to set the tone of each. While I maintain the method of reading the text through theories, these sections do not provide an extensive analysis based on the emerging subjectivities. For each enunciation that follows on from the 'social imagery' sections, I follow a process that sets up the structure of Chapter Five. I have given each enunciation a subsection and a subheading. As each enunciation has been removed from an extended text (the reflective outputs in their entirety), after each subheading I provide a brief section that introduces and contextualises the enunciation. I explain any references and terms that may present ambiguities. The enunciation is then presented within the borders of a table. There are three enunciations from reflective output one, "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects" (2007) (see Appendix A) and four taken from reflective output two, "Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators" (2011) (see Appendix B). The enunciations taken from reflective output two, "Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators" will include Patrick Pitman's questions. These will be bold to mark the statements made by Pitman. After each enunciation there will be an informal heading titled **'The Split'**. This section identifies multiple subjectivities (from my own perspective) in each enunciation. These short sections draw on the methodological grounding of post-qualitative inquiry and symbolic interactions (Bhabha, 1994) in the moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. For example, based on what is articulated I may acknowledge the stated subjective opinions of specific people at the time or the contextual location or a non-human element such as a building, cultural or social artefact. The purpose of 'The Split' section is to demonstrate the fluidity and temporal subjectivities that influence emerging moments of interaction and collaboration. The next informal heading is titled **'Cultural Hybridity'**. I use Bhabha's (1994) conceptualization of cultural hybridity to create my own interpretation of the third space enunciations. This analysis aims to explore the negotiations of cultural difference in the articulated moments of interaction and collaboration. I take sections of the enunciation and I articulate how it enables me to illustrate and mobilize elements of the theoretical framework I have developed in Chapter Three. For example, Hohnen says **"When we're working with Gurrumul, we have to go with him, we have to be with him and try and make it work for him. A lot of people are quite tight and rigid and can't change the way they're structured and their business, or their family life, or anything, to go in that**

direction" (2007, para. 44). I respond to the words in the enunciation by stating what this enables me to consider, muse or formalize in relation to the chosen theories that provide deep level thinking and conceptualizations in the area of intercultural relations. For example: *Hohnen states his awareness of many people being unable to change their entrenched ways of being. Giroux (2005) emphasizes that border crossing pedagogy "must take up the dual task of not only creating new knowledge but also addressing how inequalities, power, and human suffering are rooted in basic institutional structures" (p. 21). This enables me to consider the importance of being able to challenge one's own ideological positioning especially in a relationship inscribed with cultural differences and grounded in a colonial history where the ideological assumptions of the dominant colonial are in force.*

The quotes taken from the enunciations used throughout the analysis sections of 'The Split' and 'Cultural Hybridity' will be presented in bold font to ensure they stand out from the theoretical connections. The following chapter is the analysis of the reflective outputs (as 'data'). The first section of this chapter, Section 5.2, will use Rolf De Heer's (2007) reflective output, "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects". The section will begin with a brief overview of the text in its entirety. Section 5.3, will use Patrick Pitman's interview with Michael Hohnen (2011), "Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are collaborators" before finishing with a discussion of the overall analytical findings and enabled insights.

To reiterate, I contextualise the enunciation, provide the enunciation in a frame, 'split' the enunciation into the multiplicity of subjectivity (as perceived by me) and provide a hybrid analysis by threading the enunciations through the conceptualisations of the theories. I use the enunciations to inspire and activate the theories that have guided my thinking, namely the post-colonial theories of Bhabha (1994) and border crossing theories of Giroux (2005).

Chapter 5: Analysis of the Reflective Outputs

5.1 INTRODUCTION: SOCIAL IMAGERY—PERSONAL REFLECTIONS ON WHITENESS AND THREE FILM PROJECTS

The first section in this chapter sets the tone of reflective output one, before moving into the formal analysis. De Heer (2007) begins his reflective narrative with the below enunciation:

> As a filmmaker I have found myself, over the years, involved in a number of projects in which issues of Whiteness are more overt and deeply embedded than in many films. These projects are ones that have Indigenous themes (and hence Indigenous participation) as at least part of their fabric. My responses to these issues at the time were largely instinctive and unconscious rather than articulated and intellectualised, but on some level they were often deeply considered nevertheless. (Para. 1)

De Heer (2007) begins his reflective narrative "On Whiteness and Three Separate Film Projects" in this way. I chose this segment as it sets the tone of De Heer's (2007) intentions and leads into the purpose his reflective output. Following on from this enunciation, De Heer (2007) states that the reflective output (in its entirety) was a retrospective attempt to make sense of moments of interaction and collaboration with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Although **"at the time"** his actions were **"mostly unconscious considerations" (2007, para. 1)** by reflecting on his experiences and different moments of interaction, De Heer (2007) has provided a text that also enables me to make subjective sense of negotiations of cultural difference. One of the concerns of this research is how Western ideology and agency often dominate the process and production of projects that concern Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia. De Heer's (2007) opening paragraph locates himself subjectively, as a film director concerned with how 'Whiteness' is often imbued in films that have Indigenous themes and involve Indigenous participation. De Heer (2007) recognises the colonial-like status within his professional realm and states his awareness of the domination of Western 'White' themes in films that tell Indigenous stories and involve Indigenous peoples. This opening acknowledgement

enables me to mediate a political agenda that explores notions of border crossing pedagogy and subsequent third space cultural hybridity, assisting me in addressing the research questions.

As I attempt to mobilise the theories of cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994) and border crossing pedagogy (Giroux, 2005) within the abstract location of third space enunciations, I maintain awareness of the unconscious relationship between myself and the "subject of enunciation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 53)—thus being in this context, De Heer's words. De Heer's (2007) enunciations cannot reveal a truth as he only provides a small part of the story—even then the content is 'temporal' and from his perspective at a certain moment in time. I do not provide an interpreted meaning of what De Heer (2007) 'did' or assume to know what he was thinking or feeling. The selection of text from each reflective output and analysis is subjective—the realisations and connections I make with theory through the reflective outputs are partial and would occur best in individual lived experiences. Furthermore, in my attempt to mobilise and subsequently comprehend the in-between location of the third space at a deeper level, it is with great awareness that this location is fraught with tensions and contradictions, thus making it extremely hard to ever fully understand how individual people experience cultural hybridity.

The following subsection is the first analysis where I use the described methods from Section 4.4.3 I contextualise the enunciation, provide the enunciation, and address 'The Split', before an analysis of the temporal moments of cultural hybridity.

5.1.1 Attempts at 'Cracking the Code': Negotiation at the Border…Whenever

De Heer (2007) reflects upon the first film project, which took place in 1992. It was an unmade project called *The Other Side of the Frontier* (inspired by a Henry Reynolds book). The project was an attempt to develop and produce a 'first contact' film about a "**cabin boy washed overboard and taken in by an Aboriginal tribe some two hundred years ago" (2007, para. 3).** The film was to take place on a Queensland coastline. Hopevale community, north of Cooktown in Far North Queensland, was the decided location. De Heer (2007) states that he had never been to Hopevale community before being **"duly dispatched" (para. 4)** there for three weeks to do **"research"**

(para. 4). The first week (prior to this enunciation) had not gone well. The below enunciation, De Heer (2007) is in his second week of 'researching' for the film. He reflects on the moments when he was determined to develop connections with significant people (those identified as people to be involved in the development of the screenplay) in the Aboriginal community of Hopevale. De Heer (2007) describes how the week unfolds and his attempts at making connections and 'cracking the code'.

De Heer, 2007, Para. 6—9

The second week started just as inauspiciously. I was keen to make up for lost time, so I spent a day trying to see those contacts I'd been given, to absolutely no avail. I tried to make appointments, I tried to pin down times, create certainties, but the harder I tried, the further away slipped any connection I was attempting. As I left that first evening to drive back to my motel room in Cooktown (for which I was now grateful), it was apparent to me that unless I approached things differently, unless I "cracked the code", then my entire trip would be a monumental waste of time and money.

I'd noticed, outside the Council offices, an area where at most times of the day people just sat, or sat and smoked. There was not a lot of social interaction, mainly a shifting group of between two and five people sitting in the shade of a tree passing the time of day with an occasional cigarette, an occasional word to a passer-by or a fellow smoker. I thought I might plant myself there and just wait: those I needed to see would soon find out where I was, and I might even make contact with some new people.

Day one of the wait was discouraging. By mid-afternoon I'd run out of cigarettes and only three people had even acknowledged my existence. Having no other way to penetrate this alien culture, being able to think of no other plan, I arrived again the next day and sat down again, a spot just outside the main sitting area so as to be there without directly intruding. Results were a little better. I began to recognise the regulars, a number of whom nodded in my direction. One man came over and asked for a cigarette, which he smoked sitting next to me, not talking, simply looking off

while each of us smoked. Cigarette finished, he mumbled something and wandered away. And at one point during the day one of my named contacts approached me, introduced himself and said we should talk some time. Trying to appear as casual and laid back as seemed to be the mode, I replied "Whenever", which seemed to satisfy him. He nodded and walked off.

I was unvarying in my approach, and each succeeding day was an improvement on the previous one. By the end of the week I knew a number of people's names, I'd been invited into the centre of the sitting group by a man patting the ground next to him and indicating I sit there, there were snatches of conversation, occasional questions about what I was doing there. Although in many ways it was an excruciatingly difficult week, I learnt the fundamental lesson during it...if I was going to be working successfully with this community (or for that matter any other), it would only happen if I threw off the shackles of my white privileged existence and approached things in a manner consistent with their way of doing things.

The Split

There are many subjects to consider in the unfolding of cultural hybridity in this enunciation: the council office, the degree and continuity of social interactions, De Heer planted under a tree, De Heer's persistence in his desire to make contact with new people, non-verbal interaction/ smoking a cigarette, a brief and casual interaction with his 'significant' contact, and the metaphorical imagery of **"throwing off the shackles" (para.9)** of his white privileged existence and acknowledging a need to do things differently. Martin and Kamberlis (2013) clarify that this enunciation "does not represent reality but rather indexes the various ways reality might be produced and how different ways of producing reality have different social, economic and political effects" (p. 672). This section of the reflective output does not provide me with "deep structures that give form to whatever happens on the ground through talk and social interaction" (Martin & Kamberlis, 2013, p. 669) nor does the enunciation provide a method of intercultural encounter that can be picked up and replicated. However, the enunciation opens up a space for me to consider the primary interests of this research —how reflections can assist in providing social imagery of the theories I have chosen,

and subsequently inform processes of intercultural collaboration. In the next section, I read De Heer's (2007) words "through multiple theoretical insights" (Mazzei, 2014, p. 744), to mobilise the concepts of third space enunciations where translations of difference can occur. A hybrid reading and analysis enables me to engage with, to 'plug in' (Mazzei, 2014) to and 'map' (Martin & Kamberelis, 2013) various elements of border crossing pedagogy and cultural hybridity.

Cultural Hybridity

De Heer (2007) makes me aware that trying to establish certainty in his attempts at consultation was "beyond his control" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 18). He did not follow a particular method that would provide a solution for his challenge. Based on his instincts at the time, he tells us what he did, enabling me to see moments of third space cultural hybridity and the multiple subjects emerge in the performative moments. De Heer (2007) took notice of the human agency, social dynamics and material expressions within his context, enabling me to see the difference between his initial methods of arranging a meeting with his emergent, alternative attempts. His description addresses issues of engagement in both the social, locational and materiality of the community at a given time—sitting around at the council building, with other people, smoking cigarettes. He states that although this initial response to the social, locational and materiality expression provided little avail, having no other ideas **"to penetrate this alien culture" (2007, para. 3)** he continued to sit and wait; illustrating Bhabha's (1994) notion to 'dwell', in the interstitial space. De Heer (2007) claims the week had been **"excruciatingly difficult" (para. 9);** despite this, he suggests that his approach was unvarying and with each day his success improved. Pedagogical processes are a prefigured form of border crossing (Giroux, 2005). For this enunciation, I identify the pedagogical process as making connections with community, community consultation and **"trying to see those contacts" (para.6)**. De Heer (2007) states that he entered the community ready to make appointments, pin down times and create certainties. He also acknowledges once his initial pedagogy did not work, he needed to **'crack the code'** and approach things differently. Cultural hybridity depends on the movement into something different, unfamiliar and new (Bhabha, 1994). De Heer's (2007) imagery enables me to think about the experience

of moving into an unknown space and challenging dominant ways of social practice when building intercultural relations (Giroux, 2005). This acknowledgement assists in connecting to the "occult instability" Bhabha (1994) refers to—"the willingness to descend into that alien territory" (p. 56), a place of not knowing, but willingness to engage in a process that is different. This articulation of third space enunciation enables me to see the potential and productivity of cultural hybridity in addressing how differences can be negotiated in moments of intercultural collaboration, supporting the pedagogical and political concerns imbued in the intercultural space of colonial relations.

De Heer (2007) states **"I tried to make appointments… pin down times, but the harder I tried, the further away slipped any connection I was attempting" (para. 3).** He thus tells us how he amended his approach of community engagement and interaction. This enables me to think about negotiations of difference in terms of social behaviours and ways of communicating, especially from the perspective of someone (myself) who identifies with dominant Western ideology and forms of communication. As people learn to behave and think in a certain way, there is a tendency to consider our own ways as universal. These attitudes and beliefs are often difficult to change and unlearn (Kalscheuer, 2008). In Section 2.3 of the Literature Review, I explored some of the suggested requirements that support effective intercultural collaboration and communication. Kalscheuer (2008) confers that when people are *not* confronted by cultural difference their own culture can remain unquestioned. This enunciation provides an opportunity to engage with cultural hybridity that promotes a change in attitude, way of behaving and an acknowledgement that affirms the need to try something different—perhaps even challenging inherent ways of being, placing oneself in a position of discomfort and ambiguity. De Heer (2007) states "**Day one of the wait was discouraging…I'd run out of cigarettes…only three people had even acknowledged my existence"** and then **"being able to think of no other plan, I arrived again the next day and sat down again" (para. 8).** Rather than simply claim this process of consultation as challenging and henceforth delve into an articulation of difficulties that arise at the boundaries of cultural encounters (Bhabha, 1994), De Heer's (2007) enunciation explains his attempts of consultation. Based on the understanding that it was De Heer's first time to Hopevale, the notion of consultation in this particular location was an unfamiliar practice to De Heer, therefore he was

beyond knowing what to expect. This enunciation, where consultation did not go to De Heer's (2007) initial plans, highlights how border crossing pedagogy provides opportunity to challenge prefigured expectations that have been decided upon and initiated by the dominant ways of being (Giroux, 2005). Giroux (2005) states that engaging in border crossing pedagogy (for example wanting to make connections, build relationships, engage in dialogical and communicative practice etc.) provides opportunities for people to "engage in the multiple references that constitute different cultural codes, experiences, and languages" (p. 21). Kalscheuer (2008) asserts that effective intercultural communicators are "required to be in a permanent move and change of attitudes (p. 30) and that the risk of ineffective intercultural communication is when "neither side accepts the cultural specifics of other cultures as equally true" (p. 30).

De Heer (2007) mentions three moments of interaction with people in this given enunciation. The occasional word to a passer-by, the non-verbal interaction with the man to whom he gave a cigarette and a brief meeting with one of his **"named contacts" (2007, para. 8)**. De Heer states that he was **"trying to appear as casual and laid back as seemed to be the mode" (2007, para. 8)—**quite different to his initial said actions of pinning down times/ creating certainties. There are many interpretations and translations I could make based on this articulation. I could, for example, apply the knowledge of the communicative protocols in similar contexts I have worked and lived, or apply meaning from literature that explicates the 'communicative norms' of a particular 'culture'. However, that would be beyond the limits of this text and applying fixed meaning to temporal moment in time. Instead I maintain focus on what De Heer (2007) states he did and how this can mobilize the theories of third space and border crossings. The subjectivities denoted in 'the Split' assist me to consider the symbolic interaction without assuming that the human subjectivity of De Heer (2007) holds control in this situation. Shi-Xu (2010) informs me that intercultural ways of communicating need to be reflected on at the level of social action—"people acting with each other and so upon their worlds" (p. 285). Furthermore, Bhabha (1994) asserts that postcolonial perspective challenges people to consider how we grow, relate, build new identities "constructed through a process of alterity" (p. 251)—otherness. When engaging in intercultural collaborative research or pedagogical projects, methods that outline the processes of community consultation

and making personal connections are usually well described. However, these 'outlines' are often quite prescriptive and rarely articulate how people actually engage in this process (Somerville & Perkins, 2003) and explain the challenges, successes, the negotiations of difference and move in this space.

De Heer's (2007) enunciation does not provide a prescriptive method of collaboration, but enables me to consider his described actions as cultural hybridity, enacted in moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration. Furthermore it encourages me to consider moments of 'beyond' (Bhabha, 1994) and the "very act of going beyond" (p. 6). I cannot assume what De Heer (2007) states is a representation of 'what actually happened'. For example, De Heer (2007) states he sat in a spot **"just outside the main sitting area so as to be there without directly intruding" (para. 8)—**I can't say for certain whether he was intruding or not. Who knows why the men were sitting around the council building on those particular days? Maybe De Heer was intruding.

What I can do is use his words to consider how moments of intercultural interaction are unknowable and thus 'unrepresentable' based on the understanding that they are emergent and dependent on the entanglement of human and non-human agency—the symbolic interaction (Bhabha, 1994) which cannot be contained in their entirety within the boundaries of the reflective outputs. This helps me to consider the "epistemological 'limits' of those ethnocentric ideas" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 6) that have historically been intent on containing and fixing identity and ways of being within sites of cultural exchange. A raised awareness of the "epistemological limits" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 6) at and within intercultural borders helps me to maintain focus on the elements that support the negotiation and accommodation of difference.

De Heer (2007) asserts that he needed to approach things differently if he intended to succeed. This leads me to consider the concept of 'borders' as explained and explored by Giroux (2005). Giroux concedes that "the category of 'border' signals a recognition of those epistemological, political, cultural and social margins that structure the language and history, power and difference" (p. 20). The enunciation provides a moment where these elements are recognisable and can be considered, for example challenging beliefs, changing a way of behaving and acknowledging the need to do things differently in a way that does not jeopardise the epistemological and ontological

reasoning of others or deny democratic and ethical possibilities. This section of the enunciation also enables me to see how "borders forged in domination can be challenged and redefined" (Giroux, 2005, p. 20). The third space of cultural hybridity can be used to imagine the transformational possibilities when moments are not 'going' as intended. These moments cannot necessarily be controlled, however, a deeper awareness that these moments can be negotiated and 'redefined', provides hope and vision. Allowing one to change and do something differently provides opportunities to "transform the languages, social practices, and histories that are part of colonial inheritance" (Giroux, 2005, p. 20). De Heer (2007) admits he needed to do something different. He admits he needed to **"throw off the shackles of his white privileged existence" (para. 9)**. This imagery of breaking free from 'shackles' helps me to consider the dehumanisation of the *oppressors*—those naively bound and blinded by the domineering ideology and politics of cultural hegemony. While Freire's (1979) '*Pedagogy of the Oppressed'* generally maintains focus on the oppressive force of the *oppressors*, Freire (1979) concedes that dehumanisation also refers to those who ignore, rebuke or remain ignorant of the humanity of others. Consequently, this metaphor of 'shackles' enables me to imagine breaking free of the barriers of ideology and cultural hegemony with deepened awareness of the need to cross ideological borders and explore the transformational possibilities in the third space.

This enunciation ends with De Heer (2007) acknowledging the 'barriers' of his **"white privileged existence" (para. 9)**, enabling me to consider powerful pedagogical processes of crossing borders and post-colonial visions explored in Chapter Two. Giroux (2005) refers to a process of 'cultural remapping', a process whereby people engage in a systemic analysis, identifying how dominant cultures create borders imbued with ideology generating "terror, inequality and forced exclusion" (p. 25). Kovach (2013) explains that there is limited understanding from dominant cultures with regard to how systems—education, politics, economics —respond to Indigenous experiences. She suggests that there is often "a) active suppression or b) chronic apathy" (Kovach, 2013, p. 113). These prerogative ways of responding are not indicative of the critical pedagogy of border crossing. Consequently, this enunciation of cultural hybridity assists me to see the importance of not only "reaffirming difference" (Giroux, 2005, p. 27) but the importance of also interrogating and critiquing it, and allowing it to inform pedagogical practice. De Heer's (2007) words

enable me to create an image of reaffirming difference and the subsequent actions of *doing* something *different*—embracing discomfort, being discouraged, sitting, waiting, not talking, simply looking, engaging in the apparent 'mode' and when the hybridity starts to evolve and to change, carry on with negotiated practice…Whenever.

This enunciation in its entirety provides me with a deepened awareness of the processes of 'cracking the code' at and within borders of cultural difference. Cultural hybridity enables other positions, cultural codes and ways of being to emerge. Intercultural collaboration and interaction provide opportunity for people to negotiate their own methods. How the methods unfold is dependent on the imbued characteristics entangled in each emergent moment.

5.1.2 Throwing off the Shackles: Within Cultural Borders, Out Bush

This enunciation has De Heer (2007) recounting a bush trip he went on with the 'old man' with whom he was working. The enunciation begins and ends with reflective thoughts about his experiences thus far—what he has learnt and how he is approaching matters.

De Heer, 2007, para. 10 - 13

By this stage I'd begun to regret my comfortable hotel room an hour's drive away; it felt like a barrier between me and the people I'd come to know a little. An old man asked me where I was staying. I mentioned the name of the hotel in Cooktown, but something in my tone alerted him. He sat quietly for twenty minutes, then said he was going bush for a few days the following day...would I care to accompany him? And so I went bush for the remainder of my stay at Hopevale, with a family group of about eight or ten, kids and women included, headed by the old man. He showed me things, tried to teach me: his land and its beautiful, almost desolate beaches, utterly empty apart from the washed-up plastic rubbish thrown overboard from passing ships; what to eat, what not to eat; how to make spears; where to find fresh water even yards out to sea; round the campfire, history of Hopevale, of its setting up as a mission station, history of old times before Hopevale ever existed. Near the river a couple of nights I was given the most dangerous sleeping spot, because

crocodiles prefer eating black people over white people...the old man and another slept on top of the Troop Carrier we had for transport, the women and children slept inside the vehicle, I slept on the ground underneath.

Instinctively I asked no questions and ventured no opinions, simply waiting to be told what to do and then doing what I was told. It turned out that this was exactly the correct form of behaviour: notions of cultural and racial difference evaporated as I became what in essence I was, an uninitiated and therefore ignorant "youth" (though I was 41 at the time) who ought correctly have no opinions for himself yet and should simply listen and learn.

I learnt the film then, in a way I could never have had I approached the research with any vestiges of my own familiar white paradigm. Whether the old man was aware of the subject matter for the proposed film and had been deliberate in his arrangements I'll never know, but I became that cabin boy in the story, a stranger at first but gradually assimilated into the ways of the people who'd taken him in."

The Split

This enunciation begins with multiple subjects: De Heer's mindset and the tone of his voice, his 'comfortable' hotel room, the distance between himself and the community, the old man, the 20 minute timeframe he sat waiting quietly and the social act of asking a question. In the next section, De Heer (2007) recounts his experience out bush with the 'old man' and his family. Again there are many subjectivities working in the unfolding of De Heer's (2007) experience. There were 8-10 people, all of who were unfamiliar to De Heer, the multiple locations and their materiality—the **"almost desolate beaches" (De Heer, 2007, para. 12)** and surrounding bushlands, full of non-human agency—food, tools, fresh water, washed up rubbish, campfire, the Troop Carrier and crocodiles in the river. And again, another metaphor; De Heer as the cabin boy, **"a stranger at first, but gradually assimilated into the ways of the people who'd taken him in" (2007, para. 13).** These are just the subjectivities revealed to me in the text, from one subjective perspective, thus creating an enunciation of third space hybridity.

Cultural Hybridity

In the previous enunciation, De Heer (2007) acknowledges that in order to make it work—accommodate and negotiate the intercultural space—he would have to confront and challenge his own way of being. De Heer's (2007) enunciation makes me aware of the boundaries that create challenges at sites of cultural difference and confronting and negotiating this complex space. De Heer (2007) reflects on the subjectivities that he thought were barriers between himself and the people of Hopevale: "**By this stage I'd begun to regret my comfortable hotel room an hour's drive away; it felt like a barrier between me and the people I'd come to know a little" (para. 12).** In the beginning, De Heer (2007) admits the hotel was a comfort zone—a place like 'home' where he could escape the unknown and take time to measure his intercultural encounters to this point. However, this enunciation presents the subject of the hotel as a cultural barrier.

This enunciation enables me to consider how people who engage in border crossing pedagogy, can affect a deeper, more "dialectical self-critical understanding of the limits, partiality and particularity of their own politics, values and pedagogy" (Giroux, 2005, p. 26) through being open to listen to and engage with the voices that can provide some of the missing pieces. Again, one cannot control the core intentions, perspectives or actions of others, however, one can negotiate and accommodate how each moment unfolds through a willingness to engage with the subjectivities in a way that negotiates the moment best. De Heer (2007) states that the non-human agency of the 'hotel' represented a barrier. So he left and went out bush. This acknowledgment highlights the "symbolic interaction, the connective tissue that constructs the difference between upper and lower, black and white" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 5). In each moment of social encounter we are presented with the entanglement of the 'symbolic interaction'. This interaction cannot necessarily be controlled but there is often choice in how we decide (subconsciously or otherwise) to respond with individually perceived ideas and understandings. In moments of uncertainty people can negotiate the situation to influence the cultural hybridity of the particular moment.

The section of the enunciation where De Heer (2007) remembers his stay out bush with a family group enables me to imagine another moment of third space hybridity.

De Heer (2007) has taken measure of this moment in his reflection in a way that assists in producing an image that "bridges the home and the world" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 19) —what is known and safe, merged with and challenged by the unknown. De Heer (2007) states: **I was given the most dangerous sleeping spot, because crocodiles prefer eating black people over white people..."** and **"I asked no questions and ventured no opinions" (para. 8),**

De Heer (2007) tells me how he engaged in the experience. What he learnt and how he learnt it enabled me to consider "a split in the performative present of cultural identification" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 51) De Heer is outside the boundaries of his own cultural, social and material agency and he does not have a "stable system of reference" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 51). Through his negotiation and the processes of becoming entangled in the multiple agencies, De Heer (2007) states that the barriers bound by difference **"evaporated as I became what in essence I was, an uninitiated and therefore ignorant youth who ought correctly have no opinions for himself yet and should simply listen and learn" (2007, para. 12).** This experience reflected upon and published as a single moment of third space encounter, enables me to see how De Heer (2007) used this opportunity to engage beyond his own cultural and ideological boundaries to negotiate how the different identities could work together. De Heer (2007) likens himself with the 'cabin boy' in the story—lost, a stranger, and guided by the people who'd taken him in.

This enunciation, in particular the metaphorical musings of the **'cabin boy'**, and the notion of **'ignorant youth'** helps me to think about ways to "redescribe our cultural contemporaneity" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 10)—the way people are positioned in moments of intercultural interactions and collaborations, without applying fixed representations within a complex space. As explored throughout Section 2.3 of Chapter Two, the process of intercultural interaction and collaboration is an extremely important element, which contributes to the authenticity of the final 'product' (Selby, 2004; Somerville & Perkins, 2004; Goodall, 2005). I also discuss how this 'process' is difficult (if at all possible) to prescribe. My research project set up the overarching research question around exploring how moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration are negotiated. The moments used, are "inscriptions of signs of cultural memory and sites of political agency" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 11) constructed from the

perspective of one subjective positioning. De Heer (2007) states: "**I learnt the film then, in a way I could never have had I approached the research with any vestiges of my own familiar white paradigm" (para. 13).**

The ontological grounding of my research does not assume that the reflective outputs are a 'given'—therefore I do not read beyond the boundaries of the text and apply underlying meaning; I am aware that the reflective outputs do not "tell us what the world is really like so we can know it and adjust our living accordingly" (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 225). However, enunciations of the third space of cultural hybridity, locates a place where the politics and pedagogy of cultural differences can be negotiated. Metaphors enable me to consider cultural translation and negotiation that does not prescribe a rigid process, rather a way, a mindset or belief that prepares people in the here and now for moments when they enter the 'beyond'. Bhabha (1994) explains that to be in the 'beyond', "is to inhabit an intervening space" (p. 10), a space that conjures revisionary imaginings but "reinscribes our human, historic commonality" (p. 7). The metaphors become part of the way people intervene in the here and now (Bhabha, 1994).

Theories and certain practices of critical pedagogy, as discussed throughout Chapter Two (Nakata, 2007; Wallace, 2011; Kaslchesure, 2008; McGloin, 2009) and Three (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2005), centre on the transformation of individuals or individual consciousness. At the time of composing this particular enunciation, De Heer (2007) concludes with conviction in his beliefs about ways of working within an intercultural paradigm: **"without the vestiges of my own familiar white paradigm" (para. 13).** This acknowledgement of De Heer's, along with the similar others identified throughout this chapter, enable me to consider the intellectual understanding that 'solutions' to ways of working and ways of being and becoming are beyond *his* own jurisdiction. Through his encounters with people in Hopevale, De Heer (2007) describes how they have assisted him to critically interrogate the presence of non-Indigenous, white authority—especially in the creation of films that tell Indigenous stories.

Although this enunciation does not necessarily explain rigorous processes of 'working together' or collaborating—for example, planning the film and actioning the

collaborative processes—it enables me to consider the importance of learning together and learning to negotiate a space which is always becoming. Regardless of which moments De Heer (2007) described in his reflective output, a definite solution to how intercultural encounters and collaborations 'work' would not prevail. Giroux (2014) proclaims that we live in cultural spaces that are unfixed. Within these hybrid spaces it "becomes difficult to deny that different groups, communities and people are increasingly bound to each other in a myriad of complex relationships" (2014, p. 38). This enunciation enables imaginings of a space where "discontinuities, continuities and convergences of knowledge" (Nakata, 2011, p. 7) can be appreciated for both the complexities and profound wealth of different and unique knowledge that exists there. De Heer's (2007) metaphors enable me to imagine how border-crossers have the means to negotiate a way "to make different narratives available to themselves" (Giroux, 2005, p. 27).

This enunciation provides me with insight into how De Heer (2007) continued his journey in making connections with relevant people in Hopevale community. He maintains awareness of his cultural difference and his reflections enable me to consider his critical awareness. His articulations suggest an embracing of the critical attributes of border pedagogy, engaging in dialogue and being actively aware of communication processes, critically reflecting on intercultural encounters and a challenge to preconceived assumptions to understand ways of being from different perspectives.
De Heer's (2007) enunciation enables me to see how the space of intercultural encounter is productive and performative (Bhabha, 1994; Giroux, 2005; Martin & Kamberelis, 2013). Temporal moments of intercultural interaction are out of our control, but within our ability to negotiate the processes as they happen. For this reason and similarly to Lather (2013), I am not comfortable with codifying and disciplining "the beyond" (p. 642). As I have already acknowledged, there are too many missing pieces and perspectives denying me to promote an essentialist representation of intercultural collaboration. To create categories and apply labels in order to checklist what De Heer (2007) 'did' (10 -15 years ago) and present it as a defensible representation prohibits me from delving into different areas of consideration. However, rather than coding and announcing "best practice" grounded in "limit situations" (Lather, 2013, p. 642), I will maintain focus on the cultural hybridity of the enunciations. How De Heer (2007) provides enunciations that describe that way he

engaged in the entanglement of agency in the third space of intercultural encounters of each given and unique moment. This enunciation assisted me to consider how each moment of hybridity, bound by all subjectivities, has a productive and performative consequence that impacts relationships and subsequent moments in some way. The entanglement of all elements of agency in this enunciation led to a seemingly invaluable experience for De Heer.

5.1.3 Relinquishing Power: Destabilising the Stable

This enunciation follows on from the other moments with similar articulations—the complexity of cultural difference, reflections on actions grounded in uncertainties, a growing awareness of the power dynamics instilled in colonial relations and the ongoing learning and discovery of an alternative cultural paradigm. De Heer's (2007) reflections address the making of the film '*Ten Canoes',* a film he eventually co-directed with Yolngu man Peter Djigirr. However, he talks initially about his relationship with David Gulpilil (Yolngu man from Ramingining and Australian actor) and Gulpilil's desire to make a film with De Heer. De Heer (2007) talks about his feelings of apprehension about making a film that had such a dependence on strong partnerships and processes beyond borders of cultural difference. Towards the conclusion of this enunciation, De Heer (2007) acknowledges and associates his identity as a 'white man' and the title of his professional position as 'director' with how this might affect others' perception of him and as a consequence affect how people behave and interact with one another. This will be a main feature in the analysis of cultural hybridity.

De Heer, 2007, para. 34 – 38

But it was during the making of *Ten Canoes*, a film populated entirely by Indigenous people speaking their own language, and set before white people began wandering the globe in search of lands to colonise, that the issues surrounding a white film maker telling a black story had their greatest resonance.

From the second time I ever met him, when we discussed making *The Tracker* together, David Gulpilil had asked me consistently and frequently to make a film

with him and his people, on his ancestral lands. For some years I'd resisted, for many reasons, not the least being the difficulties in communication. David speaks passable English, but few of the people up in Ramingining, where he comes from, do half as well. Ramingining has to be experienced to be understood. It is a foreign, alien culture in Ramingining and I had little confidence in our ability to accumulate the material required for a feature film of sufficient quality to play in the cinemas of the world.

But then it struck me that there was one way in which this *might* be achievable: relinquish the almost absolute power normally associated with producing and directing a film and cede it to the people I'd be making this with; give them editorial control and as much responsibility for the film as we, the white film makers, had responsibility. It was an approach fraught with tremendous risk, but if somehow a true partnership could be made out of the venture, with me acting as the film-expert facilitator, then there was just a chance that something could work, in both process and product.

In some strangely confluent ways, the privileges (and consequent blindnesses) that inform the power structures of making a film are a metaphor for white privilege and blindness in general society. The director is seen, usually to begin with anyway, as a superior being not only because of the power they might have, but simply by dint of the title attached to the job. It is a perception that often suits the occupant of the job, who then generally behaves according to that perception.

It was my (semi-conscious) reasoning that all this had to be dismantled, that notions of superiority and privilege had to make way for a perception by all those involved, white and black, of themselves as equals in the venture. This was not some warm and fuzzy ideal but a necessary part of the risk minimisation strategy, and the difficulty here was that we were dealing with a double layer of this perception...not only was I the director and hence the expert who knew everything, but I was also white, and hence I ought at any rate to know a whole lot more than them.

The Split

The articulation of the enunciation is De Heer's (2007) and although this seems to place him "in the center of inquiry" (Jackson, 2013, p. 746) there are many factors in play—some articulated, many not—that deny me the ability to essentialise his "human experience via a reductive process of coding" (Jackson, 2013, p. 746). Rather, I continue to explore the evolving and unknown nature of human experience through cultural hybridity. De Heer's (2007) ways of being, entangled with the hybridity of the cultural, social and material difference, is "ontologically becoming in their temporal emergence" (Jackson, 2013, p. 746). If I 'split' this enunciation into the symbolic interactions (Bhabha, 1994) that I perceive to influence the moments of intercultural collaboration, the multiplicity of subjectivity can be (subjectively) revealed.

De Heer (2007) acknowledges his (initial and long standing) resistance to commit to making the film due to the many human and non-human elements to consider. For example communication and the sheer difference between languages, cultures and the location of ancestral land, the ability to accumulate the materials required to meet the needs and the subjective standards of the **"cinemas of the world" (2007, para. 34).** De Heer (2007) talks about how the film *might* be achievable. The association of privilege, power and control with cultural identity and the title and status of one's professional position, reveal elements of human agency. The final subjectivity that appeals to me is the apparent will of both De Heer and Gulpilil to make the film.

Cultural Hybridity

David Gulpilil and Rolf De Heer's relationship is bound by their collaborative professional practice. Gulpilil is an award winning actor and De Heer is a film director. De Heer (2007) states that for years he had resisted making a film (*Ten Canoes*) with Gulpilil and his people on their ancestral land. He states two reasons: the difficulties in communication due to language differences and a lack of confidence in their **"ability to accumulate the material required for a feature film of sufficient quality to play in the cinemas of the world" (2007, para. 34)**. This enunciation enables me to mobilise the theories of border crossing and third space hybridity. De Heer denotes once again his "semi-conscious" becoming as an intercultural partner and collaborator was entangled in an increasing awareness of the material, social and cultural agency of Western, and non-Indigenous, white ideology. De Heer (2007) compares the power

structures of making a film with the power structures in colonial relationships: grounded in **"white privilege and blindness in general society", (para. 36).** His words provide a metaphor that again assists me to muse the site of political agency and ways of negotiating difference and the 'unknown' in moments of intercultural collaboration. Border crossing pedagogy, encourages people to engage with, and subsequently question the way in which our history and our positioning in society defines us (Giroux, 2005). This is an interrogative process of locating oneself for the necessity of engaging and "often unlearning the habits of institutional privilege that buttress their own power while sometimes preventing others from becoming questioning subjects" (Giroux, 2005. p. 27).

As quoted in Chapter Four, Bhabha (1994) refers to social and cultural beings as "literary creatures and political animals" (p. 17) who should familiarise themselves with the social world as a place where human action does not prevail as 'in control'. This enunciation provides acknowledgement of the demands of making a film in a **"foreign, alien culture"** and the expectations of the **"cinemas of the world" (2007, para. 34)**—both reasons attributed to the agency and cultural demands of a "stable system of reference" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 51). Border crossing pedagogy (negotiating differences and ways of being in an intercultural partnership) can entail crossing cultural borders and entering a location where the 'stable system' is disturbed. The power structures that apply (or are assumed) are problematized and what is considered a 'stable system' of reference for different people, is acknowledged and legitimised. De Heer (2007) states that he had to dismantle **"notions of superiority and privilege had to make way for a perception by all those involved, white and black, of themselves of equal in the venture" (2007, para. 37)**. This acknowledgement elucidates Giroux's (2005) theorisation of habits of institutional privilege. De Heer (2007) also states (with a certain authority that resonates with the necessary characteristics of a border pedagogue): **"this was not some warm and fuzzy ideal but a necessary part of the risk minimisation strategy." (2007, para. 37)** Dismantling, challenging and talking back to the superiority of institutional privilege that denies people "to speak in the places where those who have power exercise authority" (Giroux, 2005. p. 25) is critical for border pedagogues (in any vocational realm) to consider how the narratives of those who experience marginality. Border

crossing pedagogy requires people to challenge and question the authority and institutional privilege.

De Heer (2007) states that a way in which directing a film with Gulpilil *might* be achievable, is to relinquish his power. De Heer acknowledges the "existing configurations of power" (Giroux, 2005, p. 20) between himself (as 'white man' and film director) and the people of Ramingining. The notion of 'border' and 'boundaries' (when considering intercultural interactions and collaboration) are inscribed with power in different ways depending on the formation of the relationship. This enunciation provides me with signals that promote the importance of critical reasoning when approaching the boundaries of cultural difference. As stated quite often throughout this analysis, moments of social interaction cannot be controlled, predicted or prescribed—each emerging moment is in the beyond. However, when considering and reflecting on this 'space' (in particular, the way in which it is approached with the intention of engaging in a collaborative form of pedagogical practice), critical reasoning can address the aspects that contribute to the negotiation of a 'pedagogy' that is transformative.

De Heer's (2007) acknowledgement of the **"double layer of this perception" (2007, para. 37)**—formal power as a 'white man' and the assumed power imbued characteristics of 'film director'—enables me to envision attempts of border crossing pedagogy. This acknowledgment reminds me of the importance of critically questioning the tensions that exist in the relationship that binds the intercultural collaboration. It also draws my attention to discourse that so often omits the complex configurations of power and refrains from crossing "ideological and political borders" (Giroux, 2005, p. 25). De Heer (2007) states his awareness of the perceptions attached to both his white privilege and his role as 'film director'. An awareness of one's positioning in relation to the history of colonisation, as well as awareness of how and why one comes to be part of such pedagogy (intercultural collaboration/business in crossing borders) enables me to consider the perceptions attached and the authority that particular 'positioning' promote.

So often our positions or professional 'titles'—teacher, director, manager, doctor—pertain to positions of authority. Giroux (2005) asserts that border pedagogues, those

working to challenge and cross the boundaries of power and difference, should neither abandon authority nor deny the roles connected to particular positioning; rather it is how we use authority that is of importance. For example, De Heer (2007) should not abandon his practice of directing films that tell Indigenous stories. However, he can transform his authority in this space "into an emancipatory practice" (Giroux, 2005, p. 27) that provides a forum to engage in a critical reasoning that acknowledges how we use power and authority. Working together in intercultural partnerships (with a willingness to interrogate the broader political considerations of social and cultural issues of negotiating difference) can deepen awareness of the complexities "of the traditions, histories, knowledges, and politics" (Giroux, 2005, p. 29) that people from diverse sides of the border embrace.

De Heer (2007) states that to **"relinquish the almost absolute power normally associated with producing and directing" (2007, para. 35)** and sharing the authority of making a film with Gulpilil and the people of Ramingining (De Heer as film-expert facilitator) was **"fraught with tremendous risk" (2007, para. 35).** He further states however, that if 'true' collaborative partnerships should prevail, then it might work. As acknowledged throughout this research project, a 'true partnership' is difficult to prescribe. This enunciation enables me to mobilise that thought. Unless you give the unknown and 'alien' a chance and challenge the prescriptive ways one might be accustomed to, the authenticity or establishment of a 'true' partnership will remain unknown. Giroux's (2005) notion of 'authority' and how one uses their authority in a position of power, helps me to consider how to maintain professional integrity without damaging or denying the professional integrity of others, also emphasizing the importance of maintaining high quality professional practice and staying 'true' and respectful to the binding relationship. De Heer (2007) states that his way of thinking (and thus doing) had potential to work **"both in process and product" (para. 36).** Critical reasoning of difference and acting upon this reasoning in order to negotiate an unknown or 'alien' way of being has potential to strengthen the reconciliatory process of working together in a negotiated intercultural partnership and the authenticity, effectiveness and success of the final product.

The following section, Section 5.2, will begin the analysis for the second reflective output, "Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators" (2011).

5.2 INTRODUCTION: SOCIAL IMAGERY—MICHAEL HOHNEN AND GURRUMUL ARE COLLABORATORS

As Patrick Pittman describes a snapshot of collaboration unfold before him, we are exposed to a single albeit short, moment of cultural hybridity:

> Gurrumul is sitting in the window of the ballroom, finger-picking contentedly on his Martin steel string. Cory, our photographer, is talking the blues with him. He smiles, happy to keep playing. The room goes quiet. It's just him and his guitar in this cavernous space. His drummer, leaning against the wall, begins to air drum, mouthing soft brushes. Michael walks to the wall, picking up his double bass. He slides up alongside Gurrumul, and begins to pluck. As the guitar and the air drums and the bass cohere into a jam, I get it. I feel it. Collaboration, the kind that connects people several layers deep. I am transfixed. (Para.3)

This enunciation provided by Pittman (2011) enables me to envision the "interstitial intimacy" (Bhabha, 1994, 19) and sets the tone for this section of the analysis. At the time of this interview, Hohnen (2011) denotes that neither he nor Gurrumul get involved with the politics that surround their working relationship. Rather, his enunciations maintain focus on the temporal moments that allow readers of this interview transcript (the reflective output) to imagine the merging of two worlds through reflections that describe how they do things together. The above enunciation (para.3) from Pittman (2011) assists me to imagine temporal symbolic interactions at their best; the subjectivities that "bridge the home and the world" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 19) and the fusion of shared and passionate visions. The window of the ballroom, Gurrumul perceived as content while finger-picking his steel string guitar, the photographer, the drummer (playing air drums), the proximity of Hohnen to Gurrumul and the cohesiveness of everyone as they begin to play. Before entering the formal part of the interview, Pittman (2011) urges the audience of this reflective output: **"Slow down, soak this up" (subtitle).** The enunciations allow me to take measure and dwell in temporal moments of cultural hybridity enabling me to imagine how collaborative endeavors can be negotiated beyond borders of cultural difference.

5.2.1 The Most Amazing Experience: Cultural Hybridity at the Border

Hohnen recounts an experience—**"the most amazing experience" (para. 58)** he ever had. He articulates this experience before applying deeper meaning and understanding to the working dynamics of his and Gurrumul's partnership. In reading (and re-reading) Hohnen's (2011) unique story, I become aware of some of the seemingly obvious cultural differences. Hohnen does not 'list' the differences, they are revealed through parts of his narrative, which is more concerned with describing the performative moment of the experience. In the following enunciation Hohnen describes a fishing trip he went on with one of Gurrumul's 'poison cousins' George. The term poison cousin refers to a relation that one is obliged to avoid direct interaction.

Pittman & Hohnen, 2011, para. 52

Michael Hohnen: One of the most amazing experiences I ever had was being taken by George, who is Gurrumul's poison cousin, to the islands north of Elcho on a hunting trip, with three other older guys who were all amazing hunters. He's a *Gumatj* man as well, who used to be the lead singer of the *Warumpi* Band. They didn't speak any English for the whole trip, occasionally they would try and tell me something, but they were just focused on what they were doing, which was turtle hunting, going to an island, finding spring water, the whole day and night was a completely other experience, in Australia. I couldn't see any stars. There were clouds in the sky, there were no lights anywhere, we had no lights, we drove for two hours, past four islands, down their island, with no light at all, and got back safely at ten or eleven at night. I experienced one day that I don't think many people are going to experience. It was total intuition.

<u>The Split</u>

The symbolic interaction I perceive from this temporal moment of cultural hybridity is the human agency of George and three other older guys—**"all amazing hunters" (para. 58)**, the communicative barrier of different languages, the boat, islands, the

search for spring water, the darkness when coming home at the end of the day and Hohnen and his perception of this being a completely 'other' yet amazing experience. Hohnen (2011) ends this enunciation with the statement **"it was total intuition" (para. 52)** supporting my understanding of Bhabha's (1994) assertion that the "structure of meaning and reference" (p. 54) in relation to cultural identity and the way people construct this in discourses, is an "ambivalent process" (p. 54). Although this enunciation, through the interaction of the emerging and temporal symbols as subjectively selected above, provides me with an image that helps determine what De Heer (2011) perceived as different cultural traits or ways of being, for example turtle hunting and not speaking English (and the assumption that this was a **"completely other experience, in Australia") (para. 52).**

Cultural Hybridity

Hohnen (2011) explains that what the men were doing and what he was a part of, was completely different to what he had ever experienced and he thinks of it as a rare experience in Australia. The short narrative is symbolic of the 'beyond'. The experience in its entirety was always going to be in the beyond. There was no way for Hohnen to predict with certainty what would happen next. Each action within the process was beyond knowing—Hohnen (2011) exclaims, **"I don't know how we navigated home, I really don't" (para. 58).** Furthermore, Hohnen was only able to apply the label of **"best experience ever" (para. 52)** once it had taken place and become a moment in history—once it had begun, advanced and ended. This was *Hohnen's* best experience, his entanglement in the performative space of culture's hybridity. This experience is not an ontological given, however, the moments of intercultural collaboration, beyond the borders of Hohnen's cultural identity, provided opportunity to enable enunciations of a third space. Furthermore, the experience enabled Hohnen to apply metaphorical musings of a 'third space' to the ontology of *his* and *Gurrumul's* partnership. Rather than relying on the groundings of his own cultural perspectives, Hohnen draws on his experience to articulate his way of working in a culturally different context. Each collaborative journey is unknown, dependent on intuition, but grounded in trust, flexibility and negotiation. Just as the "meaning of symbols and culture have no primordial unity or fixity" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 55) moments of collaboration are also unpredictable and need to be negotiated as they emerge. This

enunciation assists me to think about new and different experiences and the learning gained from engaging with the narratives and ways of others in order to enrich my own cultural agency and as a result more aware and open to address the complexities of the cultural interface (Nakata, 2007).

5.2.2 Hohnen Does the Talking: Working Together / Going With It

Michael Hohnen is the label manager for Skinnyfish music and he is often the spokesperson for the partnership at media events. The following enunciation is in response to a thought-provoking question from Pittman (2011). Pittman proposes that the relationship between Hohnen and Gurrumul must generate suspicion as Hohnen is often in situations where he is talking on behalf of Gurrumul. There is a long and contested history (as explored in Chapters One, Two and Three) which still resonates strongly in current day society of non-Indigenous peoples in Australia speaking 'on behalf' of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and communities. Pittman (2011) asks Hohnen whether he thinks people are suspicious of this.

Hohnen & Pitman, 2007, para. 43 - 44

Patrick Pitman: "You find yourself in this role as a spokesman for Gurrumul as well as the label man. That must be something that people are suspicious of, the white man doing the talking?"

Michael Hohnen: I reckon. I feel it's the only choice I've got. You saw him, he doesn't want to have anything to do with it at all, and won't commit to any answers. Occasionally when he's with me for a few days, I can get a few things out of him. He listens to a lot of things that I say on radio and tells me what he thinks, in private. He doesn't come out with much to me, and we've hung out together for fifteen years. We don't talk a lot about anything that heavy, it's more of a social and musical relationship. It's a fun relationship, he has his own life and I have my own life and it's really healthy in that way. He never asks loads of questions, and I never delve deeply into his world.

When we're working with Gurrumul, we have to go with him, we have to be with him and try and make it work for him. A lot of people are quite tight and rigid and can't change the way they're structured and their business, or their family life, or anything, to go in that direction. I think that probably helps us achieve what we're doing.

The Split:

From my subject position, I split the enunciation into the human agency of Hohnen and Gurrumul; the materiality of music—their shared passion and visionary muse; the interviews, advertising and media responsibilities that welcome outsiders to question and consequently contribute further subjective perceptions of Hohnen and Gurrumul's relationship. Entangled together, they create a "hybrid site of cultural negotiation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 255)

Enunciations provide moments where multiple subjects emerge and are melded together, revealing differences that exist in a temporal moment of intercultural encounter and collaboration. Bhabha (1994) informs that these differences cannot be totalized as there is no common measure for differences that dwell in the same space —the same signifying moment. Each moment is entangled with multiplicities that create the signifying differences, before being reinscribed and relocated by another enunciative attempt (Bhabha, 1994). Once a moment of cultural hybridity has passed, Bhabha (1994) states:

> The enunciative is a more dialogic process that attempts to track displacements and realignments that are the effects of cultural antagonism and articulations—subverting the rationale of the hegemonic moment and relocating alternative, hybrid sites of cultural negotiation. (p. 255)

Attempting to "codify and discipline" (Lather, 2013, p. 642) this enunciation would leave little room for the "inscription of cultural incommensurability" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 254). This current enunciation, once again, demonstrates how moments are "structured by relations of difference" (Lather, 2013, p. 643).

Cultural Hybridity:

Hohnen (2011) responds to Pitman's question simply, yet with certainty: **"I reckon" (para. 43).** Hohnen continues his enunciation with an explanation of how and why he is both the 'label man' and 'spokesman' for Gurrumul. Hohnen's role and responsibility is to be the person who speaks to media—advertises, promotes and seemingly speaks 'on behalf' of Gurrumul. Hohnen asserts—"**I feel it's the only choice I've got" (para. 43)—**Gurrumul won't do interviews. Gurrumul stays attuned to what Hohnen talks about and will let him know what he thinks. Hohnen states that this process is private, between them and happens when it happens—occasionally. From Hohnen's perspective, he states that the relationship is social, fun and united by music. Hohnen also acknowledges boundaries that each of them choose not to cross which assists in maintaining a healthy relationship. Hohnen reflects upon what he thinks helps them achieve in what they do. With regard to working with Gurrumul, **"we have to go with him, we have to be with him and try and make it work for him" (para. 44).** The overall social imagery of this enunciation enables me to consider the instability of the third space, with regard to certainty or the 'unknown'. The processes of negotiation are always evolving and bound by temporal movements (Bhabha, 1994).

Hohnen (2011) states (in reference to how he works with Gurrumul) he has to **"go with him, we have to be with him and try and make it work for him" (para. 44)** The previous chapters in this dissertation have explored and acknowledged how processes of intercultural collaboration are often subjugated by the self-imposed superiority of the dominant *other*, non-Indigenous people. While there are many people working effectively in negotiated intercultural partnerships, 'suspicion' often remains due to the political bindings of the colonial relationship as well as current and continuing acts of cultural domination in many realms of society. Patrick Pittman's (2011) question is thought provoking and political—initially creating imaginings of Hohnen as the **"white man doing the talking",** dominating the partnership, reveling in the glory of the music's success, rousing suspicion. I am reminded however of the 'new ontology' of post-qualitative methodology that challenge the binaries that "pervade our language and thus living" (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 655). Furthermore, I need to 'savor my critical edge' and work within the limits (the boundaries) of the text

(Lather, 2013). The following section explores how binary accounts can produce a language that pervades the way we perceive certain situations—not based on the unique, individual, emergent moments, but based on our perceptions from what we have read, learnt and thus live. The binary opposition that this enunciation considers and challenges is the one of Hohnen as oppressor/ and Gurrumul as oppressed.

Bhabha's (1994) assertion: "a moment when something is beyond control, but it is not beyond accommodation" (p. 12), is a constant reminder of the subjects that influence given moments of intercultural interaction. Cultural hybridity incites moments of uncertainty. The way other people perceive the hybridity of a particular relationship or have opinions about how it 'should be', has the potential to effect the way one behaves therefore splitting the subject of 'the white man' into another continuum. If someone believes they are evoking 'suspicion' based on totalizing assumptions about 'how to behave', this has potential to alter the way one behaves. The subjectivity of onlookers or outsiders has the potential to contribute to the way people engage in intercultural interaction. Non-Indigenous people are frequently represented in the binary opposition as dominating, more powerful and oppressive—more often than not, for justifiable reasons. A negative representation of non-Indigenous peoples is not necessarily a negative thing and as explained in Chapter Three, an acknowledgement of the power and ideology imbued in colonial relations is an important element in the production of a discourse of difference (Giroux, 2005) and a core focus for this research project. However, when applying a notion of power and control as a general conjecture to *all* non-Indigenous people working in an intercultural space (based on particular actions or observations) researchers/people risk making presupposed assertions. Generating and applying an assumed meaning to a specific situation is the pervasiveness of language that risks confining ways of living, ways of being, to a certain code or category. The notion of 'suspicion' is not for me to continue considering in relation to Hohnen and Gurrumul's relationship—whether the two are actually in a 'suspicious' relationship or not, is beyond the boundaries of the enunciation as text, therefore beyond my jurisdiction to assume. To continue exploring an intercultural space and applying interpretations or deeper meaning would deny responding to Hohnen's (2011) acknowledgement of the different subjective roles and responsibilities he and Gurrumul have negotiated. Gurrumul and Hohnen cannot control how other people regard and perceive their relationship. This enunciation enables me to consider how

individual ways of being best suit their working relationship. Hohnen's enunciation takes me beyond the border and "instead of papering over difference" (Lather, 2013, p. 642) I am able to see some of the roles for which each person is responsible, reflecting how people working in partnership are different, together. Theories of cultural hybridity also enable me to consider how relationships can change from day to day. Perhaps sometimes it is ok for Hohnen to 'speak for' Gurrumul, and perhaps there are days when it is not.

Cultural hybridity provides opportunity for people working at and within the borders of cultural difference, to negotiate the construction of their relationship (Bhabha, 1994). There are many ways this negotiation of roles and responsibilities can unfold. How this negotiation and construction develops is highly dependent on the context, the collaborative endeavor and the differing political investments of individual positions and people (Somerville & Perkins, 2003). In Section 2.3 of Chapter Two, Somerville and Perkins (2003) assert that much literature in the area of intercultural collaboration is prescriptive and does not reveal moments of negotiation. While prescriptive accounts assist in developing a deeper awareness of the important strategies and respectful behaviors one can embrace in moments of intercultural collaboration, they are not going to provide solutions for activating those strategies or behaviors. Hohnen's enunciation does not explain the negotiation process. For example, he does not disclose how they both came to know and activate their individual roles and responsibilities or how they established the expectation that neither of them **"delve deep" (para. 43)** into each other's worlds. Instead, Hohnen (2011) explains the negotiated outcome and I am reminded that within each moment, each location of cultural hybridity, the moments of intercultural encounter and collaboration are different.

Pittman's (2011) question provides Hohnen with an opportunity to talk about the politically charged space of his work. Hohnen (2011) does not extend on *why* people are suspicious or *how* this makes him feel—he goes beyond the uncomfortable feelings that may provoke suspicion and maintains focus on the working dynamics of his relationship with Gurrumul. Hohnen's (2011) enunciation displaces and realigns (Bhabha, 1994) the notion of 'suspicion'—rather than justifying why he is or is not in a 'suspicious' relationship, he "subverts the rationale of the hegemonic moment" and

creates a “hybrid site” (p. 255) by maintaining focus on how he and Gurrumul work together. Hohnen’s (2011) enunciation enables me to consider that there are two protagonists in this story. Hohnen does not deny the suspicious bindings of his relationship with Gurrumul, however, his enunciation challenges the binary opposition of oppressive/oppressed, us/them, non-Indigenous/Indigenous. He displaces the ‘cultural antagonisms’ (Bhabha, 1994) that assume him suspicious and goes beyond the border of cultural difference.

Hohnen’s (2011) articulation of their communicative relationship reminds me that there is not a prescriptive way to engage in intercultural communication. Hohnen (2011) articulates the outcomes of their negotiations. He states that neither delves deep into the other’s world; they are focused on shared visions and mutual understandings of their roles and responsibilities. Although deemed important, it is difficult to prescribe a method of dialogue and communication within unique and diverse relationships.

Gurrumul’s choice not to be involved in media events and Hohnen’s attitude and acceptance of this, makes me think about how an increased awareness of one another’s abilities, limitations and ways of working (established in moments of cultural hybridity) supports the relationship to grow and transform with clear understandings of what each other bring to the partnership- this is not to say that the roles and responsibilities do not change. Hohnen (2011) states an awareness of situations that potentially cause angst for Gurrumul (remembering that I only have ‘one voice’, therefore cannot be certain that what Hohnen says is fact) assist me to consider the importance of negotiating roles even if it means creating ‘suspicion’ or putting oneself in awkward situations. Clarity and acceptance of roles and responsibilities helps me to envisage a partnership that allows each person to stay focused, remain creative and truthful not only to each other and themselves, but the shared vision/collaborative endeavor.

5.2.3 Making an Album Together

This enunciation talks about how Hohnen and Gurrumul make an album together, giving me insight into some of the active and reflective processes. Gurrumul will play

something; Hohnen will listen and give his opinion of Gurrumul's music. This seems to be just the very beginning of the songwriting journey. Hohnen talks about the back and forth processes of creating an album; specifically with regard to certain protocols that Gurrumul needs to attend to before formalizing a recording.

Hohnen & Pitman, 2011, para. 41—45

Patrick Pitman: Let's talk about how you guys make an album together. Does he bring songs to you; does he sing to you, do you jam them out? How does it work?

Michael Hohnen: Yeah he does. He'll play something in the hotel, and I'll say it sounds great, so he'll work on it for a while longer. Six or twelve months later, he'll have lyrics for it, and he's checked those lyrics with lots of family members. It makes sense, he doesn't want to present something to the public until he knows and he's been told by not just one person but lots of different people that it makes sense. You should use that ancestor's work, or you can't phrase it like that.

One interesting thing for this album is that I've heard two or three really strong songs by his family. I'll say to him, what about that song by those guys. Now, I need about three or four years—I suggested one song on this album about three years ago, and then last year he played it for me, in a dressing room.
He didn't say anything, but we were just sitting there and he played it and sang it to me. That was like saying:
"Oh, Michael, you know that song you asked me to do two or three years ago? Here it is."
There was none of that, but he just sat there grinning, because he knows that I thought that would be a great song for this album. Or something that he should do in the future, so it's more me seeding ideas, him going with some and him rejecting some totally.

There was another song that we wanted on this record which was a Manduwuy (Yunupingu of Yothu Yindi) song, from their big album, and we talked about it, he

suggested it, and we couldn't get in touch with Manduwuy for two or three days while we were in the studio. He wouldn't do it until he'd been given the go-ahead, so we didn't do it on the album.

The Split:

When splitting this enunciation, I maintain awareness of the isolated subjectivities that exist in a single moment of cultural hybridity, "enmeshed in a web of connections" (Martin & Kamberlis, 2013, p. 669). Furthermore, I am aware that as researcher I contribute my own "operationalizing variables" (Martin & Kamberlis, 2013, p. 669) and that this enunciation can be "appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 55). Acknowledging the multiplicity within single moments of cultural hybridity enables me to accentuate and celebrate "proliferative modes of thinking, acting, and being rather than unitary, static, binary and totalizing modes" (Martin & Kamberlis, 2013, p. 670). The two protagonists—Michael Hohnen and Geoffrey Gurrumul Yunupingu—are 'enmeshed' with the other subjectivities that work together to create the emergent differences, similarities and limits within the relationship. The subject of time, cultural tradition, family epistemology (knowledge) and ontology (ways of being), and (once again) music, are mutually produced in the temporal performative enactments (Mazzei, 2014) of cultural hybridity—and well beyond my jurisdiction to analyze and apply an interpreted meaning. I continue to use a hybrid analysis that allows me to make connections between the words as enunciations, with the theories that mobilize them and provide musings of negotiations of cultural difference.

Cultural Hybridity:

Patrick Pittman's (2011) question lends itself to challenge the binary—**"Let's talk about how you guys make an album together" (para. 41)—**mobilizing Bhabha's (1994) acknowledgment of the "emergent sign of cultural difference produced in the ambivalent movement between the pedagogical and performative" (p. 234). Section 2.2.2 of this thesis acknowledges the rise of Indigenous methodologies and epistemologies becoming naturalized within educational realms. Furthermore, Indigenous pedagogies are becoming more recognized in sites of cross-cultural learning (Battiste & Youngblood, 2009). The challenge, however, is the continuing

struggle to displace the dominating power of Western knowledge and ways of being (Battiste, 2009; Kovach, 2013). Although Hohnen's (2011) explanations do not explicitly state that he changes to adapt to the intercultural encounters based on the cultural responsibilities of Gurrumul or that the album writing processes he and Gurrumul follow are 'out of his control', his enunciation assists in mobilizing notions of that conceptualize the 'beyond'. The songwriting processes cannot be prescribed. There may be reoccurring elements that arise, for example Gurrumul needing to check certain lyrics with family, however, 'how they make an album' in its entirety cannot be prescribed. The enunciation emphasizes the notion of cultural hybridity that suggests that moments of social and cultural interaction cannot be controlled but can be accommodated for. Hohnen cannot control when Gurrumul completes a song ready for recording, but he accommodates the process.

This research does not attempt to define elements of cultural knowledge or identity, or assume specific pedagogical practices based on my subjective positioning and ever growing awareness of Indigenous epistemology and ontological groundings. The core focus of this research is the collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples at the level of human encounter entangled with the non-human agency—"working to achieve a meeting of difference but equally significant knowledges and knowledge systems" (Worby Et al. 2011, p. 222). Hohnen's (2011) enunciation focuses on intercultural interactions and exchange, revealing how different styles of pedagogical practice work together to enact the 'performative' of creating an album together. There are two moments of cultural hybridity I focus on in this enunciation: Firstly, Hohnen's (2011) response to the ontology (subjective ways of begin) and epistemology (what counts as knowledge for different people) of Gurrumul's song writing process and secondly, the subjectivity of 'music'. Although music emerges as a 'symbol' of subjectivity throughout most of Hohnen's (2011) reflective output it is important to "distinguish between the semblance and similitudes of the symbols across diverse cultural experiences" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 234). In previous enunciations music has featured as a common interest, shared vision and the 'thing' that continues to bring Hohnen and Gurrumul together. However, the subjectivity of music can be interpreted in multiple ways in different moments of cultural hybridity. This reminds me that the signification of each subjectivity, although can be named in 'the split' for different moments, are "being constituted in the very act of enunciation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 235).

For this particular enunciation ‘music’ is entangled with the subjectivity of identity and community and the importance of this entanglement in the delivery of pedagogical practice.

5.2.4 Cultural Difference

This enunciation taken from the reflective output is positioned at the conclusion of Hohnen’s (2011) interview with Patrick Pittman and is the last enunciation for the purpose of this research project. Pittman (2011) makes a statement about the different cultures Hohnen’s music label work across, provoking a conversation about cultural difference. Hohnen re-enters the interview to conclude with a thought provoking response to Pittman’s (2011) wonderings.

Hohnen & Pittman, 2011, para. 50-51

Patrick Pitman: You must have to work across many different cultures for the label.

Michael Hohnen: All through Arnhem Land, it’s like a miniature Europe. Think about how differently the French and the Germans think of their own cultures, language and everything is structured so differently, and it’s the same. At one stage, there were hundreds of different countries. I think we all know that much more now. There were similarities, but if you go west of Darwin, it’s quite different again.

When you go to Japan, or anywhere else, you pick up that you have to change the way you act in those countries. Unless you’re a Bogan and you go to Bali and decide that you’re going to go to parties all day and you don’t actually go and meet Balinese people and deal with them. It’s the same when you go to Aboriginal Australia; it’s a totally different world.

<u>The Split</u>

Hohnen’s (2011) response enables me to imagine moments of entering into a new and unknown place and the importance of committing to an awareness and acknowledgement of cultural difference. Rather than explicating his ‘knowledge’ of

the diversities that *may/may not* exist between the cultures he works with, he diverts focus to how his thoughts of cultural difference supports and enables cultural hybridity when he works within the multifaceted contexts of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures. His articulations refrain from naming cultural differences between himself and his collaborators and he makes no assertion that cultural difference is a problematic facet of his intercultural relationships.

Cultural Hybridity

Hohnen's (2011) articulations incite a reminder that unless an effort is made to cross or confer sense at cultural boundaries, there is potential to remain ignorant and continue to maintain interpretations of the cultural 'Other' through outsider perspectives. Bhabha's (1994) notion 'beyond' is evident in Hohnen's (2011) articulations. Hohnen (2011) suggests when 'you' go to different countries, there is a raised awareness of the need to **"change the way you act" (para. 51)** in those countries. Critical consciousness, the deepening awareness of the sociocultural reality that shapes one's way of being and the ability to alter that reality, is an important attribute in the developing capabilities to negotiate effective cultural encounters. As addressed in the Theoretical Framework Freire (1970), denotes a critical consciousness as the ongoing awareness and interpretation of experiences. Although moments of social and cultural interaction often unfold subconsciously and are beyond the control of the people engaged, critical consciousness, 'conscientizaco' (Freire, 1970), has potential to support the ongoing negotiation process and a deepened awareness of the potentiality of emerging moments of social situations and interactions. Enunciations provide opportunity for people to mobilize and apply reflective thought and critical consciousness to moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration, such as Hohnen's (2011) comparison of working with different cultures in Australia, with his awareness and critical consciousness of the cultural foundations of people and places in a foreign country.

This enunciation inspires thoughts and potential conversations about the extremely diverse and different Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural identities right here in Australia. It also amplifies yet again the inability to define how to behave within the third space and moments of intercultural collaboration based on the cultural labels that

are assumed and assigned to particular cultural groups. In saying this, a critical consciousness and awareness of the potential differences that may arise is an important characteristic of border crossing pedagogy (Giroux, 2005). As denoted in the Theoretical Framework, Section 3.3.1, localized critical theories need to bring participants into the research to create a shared space where the goals of critique, resistance and struggle are relevant and localized (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). Bhabha (1994) emphasizes that a deeper understanding and awareness of how to work across many different cultures is the performative process of cultural communication through negotiation, where there is opportunity for translation and shared understandings to evolve.

5.3 SUMMARY

Both De Heer's (2007) and Hohnen's (2011) reflections assist me to connect the inherent characteristics of third space enunciations (Bhabha, 1994) and refer to the politically motivated theories of border crossing pedagogy (Giroux, 2005). Bhabha (1994) asserts that third space enunciations destroy the "mirror of representation in which cultural knowledge is customarily revealed as an integrated, open and expanding code" (p. 54). People experience each other through a myriad of independent and unmeasurable knowledges, which in turn challenge the notion that a fixed representation will avail solutions to the complexities of intercultural collaboration. De Heer's (2007) 'unravelling' and sense-making practice provides an opportunity to consider the interplay of subjective agencies and the negotiation of cultural difference within an acknowledged awareness of how the collaborative endeavours are imbued with colonial bindings- from a 'white' perspective. While Hohnen's (2011) descriptions are less politically charged, they enable an opportunity to imagine the wonder, awe and potentially of working in such a partnership that offers different and unique ways of being in the world. The reflective outputs helped me to consider the importance of acknowledging the multiplicity of 'symbolic interactions' (Bhabha, 1994) in moments of collaboration. The temporal and emerging moments of any social interaction are beyond peoples' control, however a greater awareness and appreciation of the 'cultural codes' (Kalscheure, 2009) that also emerge has potential to support and strengthen the negotiation process. The location of 'third space' and

‘cultural borders’ carries the affliction of the colonial history of this nation and the cultural hegemony that continues to haunt the present.

Border pedagogy (Giroux, 2005) and cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994) are concerned with how ‘difference’ is enacted, performed and negotiated within sites of intercultural interactions and collaboration. Simply acknowledging ‘difference’ or naming an awareness of how there are complexities, ambiguities and inequalities that are generated at cultural borders, although important, is not enough—‘differences’ need to be actively inserted into the ‘cultural politics’ within educational sites (Giroux, 2005). This analysis demonstrates how the enunciations provided opportunity for the subjectivity of the non-Indigenous voices (Hohnen and De Heer) to articulate their negotiating processes through memory and reflection. Enabling me to move and mobilise the theories and literature that has guided, inspired and strengthened my ever-evolving understanding of the politics of power and knowledge and the influential effects they have on the relational binding of intercultural partnerships.

The following chapter in this research project is the last chapter in this dissertation. Chapter Six will bring together my learning and deepened understanding of the contested processes of engaging in collaborative endeavours within an intercultural location as well as the responsibility of border crossing pedagogues to approach the exploration of this realm (and the theories of post-colonialism) “with a certain amount of caution and respect” (Giroux, 2005, p. 1). I revisit the ontology and epistemology of this research project and address the overarching aims and purpose, especially in relation to my own professional development and ways of being.

Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The metaphorical musings of 'borders' embodies a location that cannot be assumed or spoken about in a definitive or fixed way. They are abstract and imagined spaces where the normality that one is accustomed to can become decentred, altered, challenged and rearranged. Complicity in moments once thought of as comfortable and known, can become skewed, nameless and foreign. The in-between location of intercultural collaboration has been the core focus of this research—a place where incorrect perceptions of another's world (beliefs, behaviours, customs, material agency) present the potential to create cultural conflict. Conflict doesn't arise as a result of 'difference', but through ignorance of difference (Develtere, Elsen & Pollet, 2007).

While I denote the location of third space cultural hybridity as 'abstract', I have engaged with subjective memories and enunciations upon moments of intercultural encounters to conceptualise and assign elements that provide a platform to illustrate and mobilise this location. While this chapter concludes the learning journey for this particular project, I continue to maintain a curiosity and concern for the intercultural collaboration between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia.

Cultural hybridity illustrates that actions, processes of collaboration, cultural encounters and collective creative practices are produced 'performatively' (Bhabha, 1994). Whether positive, respectful and sub-sequentially successful, or incompatible and bound with inequalities and domination, processes of intercultural collaboration are imaginings of the future and performances of the emergent present. The notion of cultural hybridity defies fixity and definite methods of ways to be or become. I have turned to the concept of an undefinable, metaphorical third space, to explore moments of intercultural interaction that destabilizes the fixed identities applied to 'difference' and "becomes the process of symbolic interaction" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 5). Capturing moments of cultural hybridity does *not* provide a totalizing or essentialist experience of collaboration in the third space, but enables a 'dwelling-in' a moment intertwined with a multitude of symbolic designations (Bhabha, 1994). Within any professional

realm and sites of intercultural practice, analysing the "broader politics of voice and difference" (Giroux, 2005, p. 25) is considered an important element in recognising how dominant cultures subjugate cultural borders. Enunciations from the perspective of non-Indigenous peoples that acknowledge the marginalisation and misrepresentation of Indigenous peoples (especially within projects or decisions that are inherently linked and potentially affect the humanity of Indigenous knowledge, and thus people) have potential to inform the collaborative process. De Heer (2007) acknowledges how he has been involved in projects where 'white' themes take over the films that tell Indigenous stories. Throughout his reflective output he troubles the borders of cultural difference by maintaining focus on his awareness of whiteness. The ability to actively acknowledge the misrepresentations or exclusion of marginalised people in hegemonic discourses (Giroux, 2005) is a core characteristic of border crossing pedagogy. Although this acknowledgement of misrepresentation and exclusion of marginalised peoples in discourse does not guarantee ethical, just or reciprocal collaborative practice, I believe it has the power to generate critical conversations that go beyond the simple acknowledgement of 'difference'.

As outlined in my personal introduction in Section 1.3, the initial inspiration and motivation for this research project was to explore the partnership between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander educators and non-Indigenous educators working together in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community schools, as 'team teachers'. The concept of 'team teaching' in remote Aboriginal community schools in the Northern Territory is often discussed as an interactive partnership between two educators—a powerful contributor to providing links between Western and Indigenous knowledge (Graham, 1999). A two-way teaching and learning embraces and promotes the importance of both Western and Indigenous knowledge systems, creating a 'new space' where educators, students and their families, from different knowledge systems, can embrace and participate in an education system that is forged together. Working in such partnerships provides an opportunity for both educators of the intercultural team, to embrace, support, learn and ultimately create collaborative educational genius within classroom settings in remote Aboriginal community schools. This partnership is the core motivation and inspiration for this inquiry. The initial research design was challenged and consequently denied by the National Ethics Committee—perhaps rightly so. Albeit frustratingly, after extensive consideration of the risks and countless

conversations with colleagues (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) who stated with conviction the importance of capturing the stories that explicated the current level of understanding and belief in the pedagogical practice of team teaching. I couldn't understand the degree in which I needed to amend 'my' project. This particular situation was out of my control, but not beyond my accommodation (Bhabha, 1994).

As this research project evolved, I became more concerned with how people in intercultural partnerships negotiated their collaborative interactions and endeavours. I moved away from focusing on a specific professional context to maintain focus on the way people (from the perspective of one person in the partnership—a noted limitation of this project) negotiated difference and ways of working in an unfamiliar context. My main task needed to identify how I could mobilise the theories I use (that guide my own thinking in this area) through the social imagery of the reflective outputs in order to inform processes of collaboration between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples. Section 6.2 will address how my understanding of the pedagogical processes of both intercultural collaboration and the precarious relationship between power and knowledge in the construction of discourses has developed through my analysis. This section binds together the literature, theories, methodologies and core motivations with which I have engaged during this research project. Section 6.3 revisits and makes connections between the initial motivations for this inquiry and the evolved construction of the 'final' product. I briefly acknowledge the pedagogical practice of two-way teaching and learning before revisiting the concept of team teaching, contextualised in the location of remote schools in Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory, Australia. As I consider my overarching question, this section will weave through my thinking in terms of how I envisage my research contributing to the area of intercultural working relationships. Section 6.4 is the last section in this thesis and my final word for now.

6.2 THE ONTOLOGICAL TURN: DISCOURSE TO SHARE THE LEARNING

Post-qualitative inquiry embraces a theoretical grounding for the basis of its analytical process. When initially engaging and constructing my understandings of this methodological approach, I had moments of doubt—composing a discourse that was

bound by theory and avoided making assertions about the 'examples' of practical processes of intercultural collaboration. Not only did it feel that I was too far removed from my own professional context, but I was constantly threading through what other people had already written about and deliberated, creating no 'new' convictions through these seemingly 'good examples' of intercultural collaboration and interaction. Furthermore, although I understood the conceptualisation of this type of inquiry and agreed and accepted the ethos of 'troubling' data and noting the contradictory tendencies of traditional qualitative methods, going beyond the boundaries of the text and making inferences based on the subjective assertions of the 'protagonists' (De Heer and Hohnen) seemed like a 'logical' process. I often found myself making assumptions and offering an interpreted meaning of what De Heer (2007) thought or Hohnen (2011) did. St. Pierre (2013) explains that this is one of the challenges of post-qualitative, the ease of slipping back into deep and presumptuous interpretations "with a single tell-tale word" (p. 655). Nevertheless, I believe post-qualitative inquiry provides me with an appropriate methodology to explore the ontology of post-colonial and critical theory and a suitable option when attempting to explore Indigenous paradigms. I have not entered an intercultural realm in an attempt to answer questions but to question and challenge why there are pre-decided answers from the perspective of non-Indigenous peoples and institutions. I believe that ongoing research in this area will continue to provide support for people to work better in these spaces.

Post-qualitative inquiry enables me to explore moments of intercultural negotiation while questioning processes such as coding, categorising and applying an interpreted and definite meaning to what the voices in the reflective outputs *did* or *thought*. Post-qualitative inquiry guides me to embrace the ontology of the theories I have chosen as well as interrogate and question practice that has subjugated discourses that explicate Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies through dominant Western worldviews.

The core research (Kovach, 2009; Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2003; Worby Et al., 2001; Nakata, 2009; Battiste, 2000; Battiste & Youngblood Henderson, 2008; Adyanga Akena, 2012) used to guide and deepen my awareness of the unsettled and highly disputed positioning of Indigenous peoples in literature described through the hegemonic perceptions of Western philosophical worldview, has enabled me to engage

with discourses in a more critical and questioning way. I have since paid more attention and attach deeper meaning to the way Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are represented in literature (for example, past and current research papers, newspapers and online journals, current affairs programs, televised news etc.) and are then subjectively perceived by the wider population. Furthermore, not only has this research and literature heightened my awareness of how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are often 'spoken for', but how other minority groups within different demographics are also subjected to representations from the perspective of dominant standpoint. While initially I approached this research with an awareness of the ethical considerations for a non-Indigenous researcher and outsider/visitor to *any* eligible site for the 'data collection' process, I acknowledge that the extent of this awareness was very much surface level. Furthermore, regardless of race and ethnicity each individual is a cultural hybrid. Artefacts, for example visual art works, stories, reflective journals, songs, poetry, a Facebook status update etc., that explain a subjective understanding of a certain phenomenon has the potential to change with years, months, weeks, and days, therefore cannot be treated as 'givens'. This process has increased my awareness of applying representations and empirical thought to *any* reflective perspective—Indigenous or non-Indigenous.

Post-qualitative inquiry enables me to apply the theories I have chosen and locate details that I may have missed should I have chosen to place the enunciations into my own codes, categories and inferential narrative analysis. Post-qualitative inquiry encourages time to listen and engage in dialogue with the theories and literature that has already been produced and constructed in the realm of intercultural relations. Lather (2013) states that post-qualitative inquiry supports a practice "imagined out of what is already happening, embedded in the immanence of doing" (p. 635). I believe that more time thinking, wondering and reflecting in the theories and literature that exist and enable deep thought (rather than producing knowledge and solutions for the sake of knowledge and solutions) (St. Pierre, 2013) is a fundamental step, which is often too quickly passed by. Furthermore applying the "immanence of doing" (Lather, 2013, p. 635) through the enunciations, prescriptive tendencies and assumptions of '*how to'* engage in intercultural contexts (based on totalizable discourses) can be challenged.

Post-qualitative inquiry may not be suitable for all types of qualitative research however, for the purpose of this research project (exploring the unfixed notion of 'cultural hybrid' 'relationships' and the 'intercultural') a post-qualitative inquiry was a suitable choice. The melding of literature, theory and a post-qualitative inquiry support my attempt at constructing a discourse that maintains true to the ontology of each. As explicated throughout each chapter (especially Chapters Three and Four) scholars and theorists (Giroux, 2005; Shi Xu, 2010; St.Pierre, 2013; St.Pierre & Jackson, 2014; Youngblood Jackson, 2013; Lather, 2013; Mazzei, 2014; Childers, 2014) are challenging people (for the purpose of this research, border crossing pedagogues) to embrace and construct discourses that rebuke the claim to represent "knowledge, for knowledges sake" (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 649) as well as to interrogate 'mainstream' or prescriptive discourses that tend to paper over (Lather, 2013) the tensions, complications and challenges that exist between the practicalities of intercultural interactions and the construction/write up of the master narratives.

Post-qualitative inquiry and a deepened understanding of critical and post-colonial theory have heightened my awareness of my own inability to control this space and the people within it. I believe in the importance of confronting complexity and challenges that may exist within moments of intercultural collaboration in order to "open up the chasm of cultural difference" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 45) to gain and develop a more appreciative and humble understanding of the effects 'differences' between people can create. There are two implications for future action that I will discuss in the following sections. The first will focus on the acknowledgement of symbolic interaction (Bhabha, 1994) in enunciated moments of collaboration, and the second will focus on how this process could be an opening for 'difficult' discussions of white privilege. Both implications have potential to generate conversations that navigate and exchange the contested location of the cultural interface. Throughout this next section I draw on the relevance of the initial specific focus on intercultural partnerships and collaboration within the school system with the evolved research design and my learning from this research project.

6.3 WORKING TOGETHER, INTERCULTURAL COLLABORAITON

Envisioning ways to support partnerships and collaborative endeavours between intercultural teaching teams has been the core motivation for this research project. The reflective outputs used in this project do not talk to a location that typically describes the 'teaching profession'. However, I believe I am able to apply this research to different sites of intercultural professional practice and consequently encourage myself and others to work more intelligently in this area. This particular research project does not pertain to a prescriptive or *different* method for *different* sites of professional practice. The collaborative endeavours of people who are not only driven and motivated by their core vocations (teaching, medicine, health, the arts, linguistics, history, anthropology, environment, economics etc.) but their approach and methodology in intercultural collaboration also motivate this research project. This concept of intercultural collaboration is not necessarily about individual 'expertise' in a particular profession or a question of whether it is 'easier' or more 'achievable' in alternative sites of collaboration for example, the arts. While I acknowledge that different sites bring different challenges and ease, I maintain focus on how much people want it to work—the conviction, vision, willingness and desire to negotiate difference and authentically engage with the narratives of others. More so, the willingness of non-Indigenous peoples to critique and challenge the ideological beliefs, epistemologies and ontologies that dominate the institutional sites our communities are inherently informed by.

When considering the 'products' of shared intercultural projects that sit outside my own professional realm (for example, films, music, the publication of books, texts, photographs and oral histories, medical and health initiatives, documentation of language, cultural, biological and environmental status and diversity etc.) that contribute to transformative and emancipatory movements, I do not consider these outcomes or products as 'different' therefore irrelevant. I am first inspired by the potential of reconciliatory projects that can be achieved in this space of collaboration—a product that draws on the knowledge of two worlds, different and legitimate knowledge systems. I am then curious to know and explore the ontology of the collaborators and whether they were bound, driven and moved forward by shared visions. I search for a "language in which one speaks *with* rather than exclusively *for*

others" (Giroux, 2005, p. 21). In many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community schools in Australia, local community educators are often the continuity for the students and experts in Indigenous knowledge and ways of learning. It is vital to engage in a negotiated dialogue to find common ground in the culture-sharing context in order to build authentic partnerships.

While processes of *how* to negotiate or enter into this dialogue cannot be prescribed, there are different ways people can discuss this concept that can support individual ways of working. Border pedagogy emphasises the importance of understanding "how subjectivities are produced within configurations of knowledge and power that exists outside the immediacy of one's experience but are central to forms of self and social determination" (Giroux, 2005, p. 26). From my perspective, De Heer's (2007) articulations provide third space enunciations of the active interplay of cultures within the processes of intercultural encounters and collaboration. His enunciations share his reflections of a given moment in time. He states that during these moments he needed to **"unravel and make sense of the mostly unconscious considerations (and instinctive actions)" (2007, para. 1)** at the site of intercultural encounter and collaboration. This acknowledgment of De Heer's (2007) raises my awareness of how the process of collaboration, within an intercultural context, is an ongoing learning journey—a transformative process that requires ongoing critique and negotiation. This 'learning journey' is hard for people to define or totalise as there is a constant and ever-changing entanglement of subjectivities that emerge from language, culture, history and experience, creating "multilayered and often contradictory voices" (Giroux, 2005, p. 26). De Heer's (2007) choice in words, for example 'unravel' and 'make sense', encourage me to think about the limited control individuals have over the subjectivities that emerge in moments of intercultural encounters and collaboration. At the same time De Heer's (2007) words highlight the importance subjectivities (as symbolic interactions) (Bhabha, 1994) play in the negotiation of cultural differences and identities. Within moments of social and cultural interaction "there are no unified subjects" (Giroux, 2005, p. 26) just the multiplicities of different people grounded in different histories, experiences and languages, merged together in moments of intercultural interaction.

Acknowledging the presence and ongoing emergence of symbolic interaction (both human and non-human) and making this part of my analytical process, for example

'the Split', emphasises the notion that ways to negotiate 'best practice' when working collaboratively cannot be prescribed. In each enunciated moment of intercultural interaction there are many factors at play that can be perceived differently by each 'hybrid' individual. How these elements are perceived can influence the way the emerging moments unfold. For example De Heer (2007) stated that his accommodation in Cooktown was a barrier in terms of building some sort of relationship with the community—another person may perceive accommodation *away* from the community as a positive factor, a place to 'get away' and retreat back into the comfort of what is 'known'.

In each moment of social encounter we are presented with an entanglement of the 'symbolic interaction'. This interaction cannot necessarily be controlled but there is often choice in how we decide (subconsciously or otherwise) to respond with individually perceived ideas and understandings. In moments of uncertainty people can negotiate the situation to influence the cultural hybridity of the particular moment. Suggestions and support can be provided for people working in such contexts and often (not always) participation in some form of cultural orientation/awareness process is encouraged. In my experience as an educator (across different contextual locations) I have often found that pedagogical processes such as 'building relationships', 'community engagement' and 'collaboration' are named expectations yet limited time is spent talking about and critically reflecting on individual and collective experience—the challenges, contextualised purposes and reasons why these processes are important and potentially beneficial. Perhaps an increased opportunity to reflect upon emerging subjectivities could support people to navigate collaborative processes with an increased awareness of how people are quite different and as a consequence can think, feel and behave differently in any given situation. An increased awareness of different subjective players has potential to raise awareness and legitimise difference between people. Following on from an increased awareness and legitimisation of difference, it could be imagined that an individual's understanding of moments that are 'out of one's control' (Bhahba, 1994), become more at ease, flexible and thought of as less personal (unless of course it *is* personal).

As I acknowledged in Section 4.4, I have not embraced a rigorous conceptualisation or analysis process for the concept of materiality and the non-human 'symbols' that

influence social interaction. This is an area that could be explored in further studies. As I reflect on my own experiences as an educator in Aboriginal community schools, my awareness of how materiality can implicate relationships and social interaction has heightened. For example I am more aware of the positioning of buildings in the community (in particular non-Indigenous peoples' houses and the school), the arrangement of classrooms (for example furniture and environmental print), the way people dress, the way equipment and resources are managed (for example sporting, musical, stationary, keys) and many others, all of which would be perceived and interpreted differently by different subjective people.

To reiterate Henry Giroux's (2005) assertion: border pedagogues working at and within the boundaries of cultural difference with the intention of creating transformative, emancipatory and visionary pedagogical practice, enable and encourage "a vision of community" (p. 27), where people have the right and freedom to "define themselves in terms of their distinct social formations and their broader collective hopes" (p. 27). This necessitates an awareness and ability to provide time, patience and energy to speak "*to* important social, political and cultural issues from a deeper sense of the politics of their own location and the necessity to engage and often unlearn the habits of institutional privilege" (Giroux, 2005, p. 27). The method of exploring collaboration through reflections attached to theory is also a potential way to incite the conversations that Worby Et al. (2011) claim to be a 'silent dialogue'. A dialogue that addresses post colonisation and the devastating effects on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and their Countries; a dialogue that acknowledges the current stark and legitimate differences (Smith, 1999) between Indigenous and Western worldview; a dialogue of white privilege.

6.3.1 'White' privilege

Throughout Chapter Two, I explored literature from Indigenous academics that assert the need for power and privilege (as it applies to the colonizing differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples) to be acknowledged within educational sites of co-existence (Kovach, 2013; Battiste, 2000; Wilson, 2003). Respectful and reciprocal negotiations prevail when the colonial groundings and differences of the relationship are critically examined, negotiated and become embedded in pedagogical

practice. Cultural hegemony creates imperialistic ideological assumptions and conventions in society that encompass the power to dominate intercultural encounters. Ignorance, naivety and assumptions of culturally different people deny the fluidity, openness and critical consciousness necessary to negotiate differences at cultural borders. Wallace (2011), McGloin (2009), Nakata (2007) and Kalscheuer (2008), as explored in Section 2.3.1, emphasise the importance of non-Indigenous peoples being able to challenge and critique their own dominant ideological reasoning for the purpose of becoming more actively aware of the legitimate differences between people. Taken together, their work concedes that processes of unlearning or challenging one's own ideology support processes of negotiation as opposed to remaining in a state of alterity.

Wallace's (2011) inquiry stresses the importance of respecting the narratives and voice of Indigenous peoples through active acknowledgement and respective response to their message. While this research project does not honour the voice or narrative of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples for the purpose of analysis, using the voice of non-Indigenous peoples enabled me to mobilise and imagine moments of discomfort, unlearning, challenging oneself and the notion of the 'dominant other' and to reveal processes of negotiation from the reflective perspective of potential border crossing pedagogues.

Martin Nakata (2007) stresses the importance of developing a deeper understanding of how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are positioned "at the interface of different knowledge systems, histories, traditions and practices" (p. 12). He also states "Indigenous position must be 'complicated' rather than simplified through any theoretical framing" (p. 12). I used reflective outputs from non-Indigenous people and attached critical theories in attempt to 'complicate' their individual positioning at the cultural interface to consider how this implicates Indigenous positioning. This process has potential to promote a decolonised discourse from white perspective that may encourage more non-Indigenous people to reflect on their own positions in a more critical way. De Heer (2007) makes several references to white privilege throughout his reflective narrative and from my subjective opinion, Hohnen's (2011) interview responses reflect a manner that takes heed of Gurrumul's world—a highly influential element that guides the way they work together.

There are many research projects where non-Indigenous peoples acknowledge ethical implications or outline a sequence of ethical guidelines; there are many non-Indigenous people who acknowledge Aboriginal Country when gathering for formal occasions; there are many non-Indigenous people who assert the importance of working 'two-ways' and 'community engagement'. I acknowledge that these comments made by non-Indigenous peoples can also be flippant, mechanical and reflect limited sincerity in practice. Furthermore it's difficult to perceive the sincerity of a relationship without the perspectives of all collaborators. However, an acknowledgement of white privilege and stories and reflections that unpack and actually talk through negotiations of intercultural interaction can reveal experiences of and apply meaning to, white privilege. I concede that celebrating and promoting intercultural collaboration is an important element in the move to strengthen reconciliatory partnerships and projects in Australia. I also agree, however, that in the event of risking tokenism (Worby Et al., 2011), when people embrace the opportunity to address and promote intercultural collaboration, it is also important to confront the tough questions, challenges (Goodall, 2005) and the individual ways people negotiate the potential cultural barriers and continue work together within a common and shared space of understanding.

Much of the literature featured in Section 2.2.3 (Selby, 2007; Somerville & Perkins, 2003; Goodall, 2005; McGloin, 2009) acknowledges and asserts the difficult and contested ontology of not only participating and engaging in intercultural collaborations, but the 'writing up' process and documentation of the practical processes as text. One of the core concerns is the unambiguous 'representations' (Someville & Perkins, 2003; Selby, 2007) of the cultural interface that often frequents literature as well as how the conjectures of individual people (especially when based on observations of others' documented and subjective experiences) are never neutral (Selby, 2007).

While I have not reflected upon or troubled my own specific intercultural collaborations in this research project for the purpose of analysis, this particular inquiry has enabled me to provide a snap shot (enunciation) of text that could potentially conjure the ambiguous and complex imagery of the cultural interface, allowing readers to create their own momentary social imagery alongside the critical

thinking of the chosen theories, potentially increasing the likelihood of applying a certain way of thinking without too much coercion. The theories people choose to engage with enable rigorous, deep level thinking and a framework for describing certain phenomena. I found that reading the enunciations (temporal moments of cultural hybridity) through the chosen theories subsequently helped me explain, illustrate and thus understand the theoretical concepts more thoroughly. Moreover, because the analysis was driven by the enunciations but *emphasised* the theory, I found myself swapping De Heer's (2007) and Hohnen's (2011) articulations for my own similar moments of cultural hybridity and therefore applying theory and deeper thinking to my own personal experiences.

I remember times when I first moved to live and work in an Aboriginal community in the Northern Territory that left me perplexed, embarrassed, frustrated and consequently speechless. One time, on my first trip to the community bakery to buy bread, I duly stood in a queue of seven people waiting for my turn to order. The six people before me were all Aboriginal people. I stood in line for a few moments before 'the baker' made a quick dash out the back and brought back a fresh, warm loaf of bread and headed towards me. With a hideous gut feeling, we made our transaction and I was free to go. Although I remember feeling extremely embarrassed I didn't resist the transaction. I scurried from the bakery to the comfort of my newly built demountable house behind high fences in the quiet part of town.

I have countless examples of unacceptable behaviours based on non-Indigenous peoples misinformed subjective perceptions of Indigenous peoples; blatant disrespect and the dismissal of bilingual education and community engagement initiatives, deficit attitudes that conclude that 'families don't care' or 'kids can't learn'. Once I became accustomed to these types of unacceptable ontologies and begun 'making sense' of their occurrences, it was necessary to speak up. It was unethical not to speak up. These experiences cannot be 'speechless'; they cannot be a 'silenced dialogue'. These experiences need to be told and talked about. It is without doubt that conversations regarding difference and white privilege are sensitive, complex and have potential to create frustrations or defensive attitudes and behaviours from 'white' people. These conversations are necessary but should not be made to make people feel guilty or shamed. Perhaps learning about white privilege and theories such as post-colonialism,

border crossing, whiteness and others that provide rigorous thought in this area, through personal experiences of willing people is a way to generate, facilitate and guide difficult conversation.

Although I maintain that the theories with which I have engaged for the purpose of this thesis remain highly relevant, a more thorough use of 'whiteness' theory would be extremely beneficial for future study in this area. I do not intend to be a non-Indigenous white woman who speaks *for* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. However, I do intend to speak against the ideological force of my colonial heritage—a force that continues to direct the decisions that are forever being made *for* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Western Education systems in Australia have been placed upon education systems that were established well before the invasion by the First Fleet.

Not only has this research provided clarity on my own methodological ontology of intercultural collaboration but how the construction of collaborative 'processes' can enliven theory and provide discourses that create and embrace pedagogy that advocates for (amongst many other entities) communities that are constructive, democratic and inclusive (Giroux, 2005). This research sits at and within borders of cultural difference and recognises a continual need to address and explore the partnerships between people who have the potential to create unique, visionary and collaborative modes of social and cultural agency and change. Furthermore, this research has enabled me to address the need to interrogate, (when considering sites of intercultural collaboration, pedagogical process and education), how "inequalities, power and human suffering are rooted in basic institutional structures" (Giroux, 2005, p. 21). In turn, how we (as cultural, social and educating beings) can use this knowledge to inform the way we enter borders of cultural difference. Border crossing and cultural hybridity supports and advocates for pedagogical practice that sits within the broader category of 'education' (Giroux, 2005). By critically reflecting on the different and unique methodologies embraced in emerging moments of intercultural interaction and collaboration (through the reflective outputs as well as significant literature), I have been able to give rigorous thought and consideration to varied processes of collaboration and how to 'respond' or discuss this concept within the location of schools and the professional configuration of intercultural teaching teams in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders communities.

6.4 TEMPORAL CONCLUSION

This process of evolving my ideas and focus has enabled me to develop a greater respect, awareness and acknowledgement of how contested and complex intercultural relations are between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous peoples of Australia. To enter this realm lightly and without extensive reflexivity there is a great risk in producing a self-proclaiming narrative that reinscribes a particular type of authority that counters the intentions and core essence of what was being attempted in the first place. I acknowledge that there may be moments where my research project may be perceived as slipping into colonial authority. These moments, documented as written discourse, need to be challenged, highlighted and discussed to continue to support a progressive and postcolonial way of thinking and being that can be embedded into institutional practices.

I am also aware of the contradictory elements of using a postcolonial theory without the voice of colonised people. Not including the thoughts, feeling and experiences of intercultural negotiation and collaboration from the subjective perspective of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples is one of the main limitations of this research project. This limitation, however, has challenged the assumed authority of a 'researcher' to be able to collect, document and analyse the voice of not only peoples who have been subjected to misrepresentation by non-Indigenous perspective, but all people and their subjective positioning. I have used this limitation as an opportunity to maintain focus on the 'white' perspective. By using non-Indigenous subjective experiences and a non-Indigenous subjective analysis, I am able to highlight how non-Indigenous subjectivities in and on intercultural collaborations can be explored, troubled and attached to theories that challenge colonial authority and highlight postcolonial and critical pedagogical thought. Furthermore, the theoretical foundation of this research is "challenging existing boundaries of knowledge and creating new ones" (Giroux, 2005, p. 21). Had I not been challenged to reconsider my preconceived beliefs and understandings of what constitutes as 'research', I would not have developed the growing and continuous awareness of the limits of my own jurisdictions nor would I have explored the borders of a pedagogy that emphasises an understanding of "how the relationship between power and knowledge works as both the practice of

representation and the representation of practice" (Giroux, 2005, p. 21). I reiterate my sentiments from Chapter One: it is important that I 'get this right' at this stage in my study, to prevent further contributions of white power and colonial conceptualizations of epistemologies and ontologies I will only ever know and respect as an outsider. This research has always been an honest effort to explore and strengthen reciprocal relationships between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander educators and non-Indigenous educators in the classroom, and move beyond a paradigm of power and control to negotiate respectful and reflective partnerships, working together, in a culture-sharing context.

Maintaining focus on the in-between space, where interactive moments between culturally different peoples emerge, presents opportunities for difference to be acknowledged and critiqued by the respective members of the collaborative partnership. Moments of intercultural collaboration are constructed in different ways for different members of the encounter depending on each individual's experiences and role in relation to the shared project (Somerville & Perkins, 2003). This space is not fixed—it is dynamic and can take alternative paths, opposing initial plans and intentions, much like the outcome of this research project. The way people negotiate intercultural encounters in a given moment is bound by the multiple subjectivities that exist and subsequently create difference. Somerville and Perkins (2003) concede that analyzing reflections on moments of intercultural collaboration assist in revealing the "essential emotional and intellectual work" (p. 264) of cultural contact. They describe this space as a 'discomfort zone'. The 'discomfort zone' "focuses on the productive potential of difference and the necessary work of choosing to put oneself in that space" (Somerville & Perkins, 2003, p. 264).

The processes and practicalities of intercultural interaction and collaboration cannot be controlled or prescribed—these moments are to be negotiated as they emerge at and within the boundaries of cultural difference and are influenced by the social, political and cultural elements that arise in specific locations. What I propose *can* be prescribed, however, is an awareness and openness to receiving and interpreting the critical thinking and thoughts of those such as border crossing and temporal moments of third space cultural hybridity. Furthermore, an ability to continually and critically reflect on how we (as cultural, social beings) are arranged and positioned when working,

consulting, and collaborating at the borders of cultural difference is essential for positioning intercultural partnerships.

Strong reciprocal relationships between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander educators and non-Indigenous educators, has the potential to contribute to improved workplace morale, profound professional learning and ultimately assist in providing high quality, culturally responsive teaching and learning experiences for students. When the opportunity to work in an intercultural team presents itself to the 'visiting' teacher, it would seem to be an ideal approach to becoming a culturally responsive, reflective and competent border-crossing pedagogue. To be a progressive and successful non-Indigenous educator in an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community, educating with culturally and linguistically different people, an active awareness of dominant ideology that has been imbued across the borders and boundaries of cultural difference "in an attempt to position others" (Giroux, 2005, p. 100), is a central characteristic.

I have recently moved to Wadeye, an Aboriginal town southwest of Darwin, Northern Territory, Australia. I am a non-Indigenous teacher working and living at the centre of a cultural interface. I have made the choice to locate myself here. I have made the choice to leave my 'comfort zone' and become as a result, part of a 'minority'—a non-Indigenous white person living and working in a 'remote' Aboriginal community. I have made the choice to enter into partnerships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander colleagues and students—partnerships that, in time, have the potential to 'exemplify' Peter Sutton's (2009) notion of 'unusual couples'. I use the term 'choice' and 'minority' with an upmost awareness of how these words elicit very different meanings for different people. In other words, I understand that Aboriginal and Torres Islander peoples have not *chosen* me to be their colleague or teacher. And while I suggest I often feel like part of a minority when working in Aboriginal communities, there are times when the *minority* seems to be very much still in 'control'. The emotional and intellectual work of negotiating a 'modus operandi' relies on my willingness to unlearn, challenge and subsequently emancipate the dominant ideological habits that so often suffocate the marginalised borders of cultural difference even as I *become* the 'minority'. In order to engage in the ever evolving, always emerging moments of the third space, it is my responsibility to critically reflect

on the ethos, values and beliefs I have brought from my 'comfort zone' in order to be more aware, considerate and subsequently understanding of the complexities that exist at the cultural interface.

The theoretical frame that has been mobilised through the reflective outputs of intercultural interaction and collaboration has enabled me (and potentially others) to apply deeper and more critical thought to the pedagogical practice of border crossing. The interstitial location of intercultural collaboration—the meeting place of different and legitimate knowledge systems—has been the core focus of this research. A place that is more deserving of a dialogue than it is currently granted.

Chapter 7: References

Arbon, V. (2008). *Arlathirnda ngukarnda ityirnda: Being-Knowing-Doing.* Post Pressed: Australia

Adyanga Akena, F. (2012). Critical analysis of the production of Western knowledge and its implication for Indigenous knowledge and decolonisation. *Journal of Black Studies, 43*(6), 599-619. doi: 10.1177/0021934712440448

Aigner, G., Godwell, C., Martin, J., Paulson, G., Rawnsley, J., Robertson, K., Skelton, L., Varcoe, L., & Yettica-Paulson, M (2014). *Lost Conversations: Finding new ways for black and white Australians to lead together.* Australia: Creative Commons

Battiste, M. & Youngblood Henderson, J, S. (2009). Naturalising Indigenous knowledge in Eurocentric Education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 32*(1), 5-18. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/755262421?accountid=13380

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). Te Kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Maori students in New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(5) 734-742. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2009.01.009

Bhabha. H. K. (1994). *The location of culture.* London & New York: Routledge Classics

Brinkmann, S. (2014). Doing without data. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 720 -725. doi: 10.1177/1077800414530254

Chavez, K.R. (2009). Post-colonial theory. In *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory.* Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/10.4135/9781412959384.n292

Childres, S.M. (2014). Promiscuous analysis in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 819-826.doi: 10.1177/1077800414530266

De Heer, R. (2007, September). Personal reflections on Whiteness and three film projects. *The Australian Humanities Review.* Retrieved from

http://www.australianhumanitiesreview.org/archive/Issue-August-September-2007/Deheer.html

Denzin, N.K. (2009). Critical pedagogy and democratic life or a radical democratic pedagogy. *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies, 9*(3), 379-397. doi: 10.1177/1532708609332607

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2008). Introduction: Critical methodology and Indigenous inquiry. In Denzin, N.K. Lincoln. Y.S & Smith, L.T (Eds.) *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies.* [EBL version]. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/10.4135/9781483385686.n1

Dodson, M. (2003). Unfinished business: A shadow across our relationship. In *Treaty: Let's get it right!* (pp. 30-40). Canberra, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press

Develtere, P., Elsen, B., & Pollet, I. (2007). *Compass for intercultural partnerships.* [EBL version]. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com

Freeman, V. (2014). In defence of reconciliation. *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence 27*(1), 213 -223. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA360795928&v=2.1&u=qut&it=r&p=LT&sw=w

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* London, England: Penguin Books

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield

Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach* (expanded edition) [EBL version]. Westview Press. Retrieved from: http://www.qut.eblib.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=796117&echo=1&userid=jOe6MBUcnfOP3bXP7OzZSA%3d%3d&tstamp=1378721951&id=EF7C44FAD05A1A3B0197A982A1A2B18CE1DCCB122

Giroux, H. (2005). *Border crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group

Giroux, H. (1992). Paulo Freire and the politics of post-colonialism. In McLaren, P., & Leonard, P. (Eds.) *Paulo Freire, A critical encounter* [EBL version]. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com

Goodall, H. (2005). Writing a life with Isabel Flick: An exploration in cross-cultural collaboration. *University of California Press, 27*(4), 65-82. Retrieved from http://gateway.library.qut.edu.au/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/docview/222803190?accountid=13380

Graham, B. (1999). *Working in teams in Indigenous schools in the Northern Territory.* Darwin: Northern Territory Department of Education.

Grande, S. (2013). Red-ing and word, red-ing the world. In R. Lake & T. Kress (Eds), *Paulo Freire's intellectual roots* (pp. 183-194). New York/London: Bloomsbury Publishing

Grande, S. (2000). American Indian Identity and intellectualism: The quest for a new red pedagogy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(4), 343-359. doi: 10.1080/095183900413296

Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language.* New York: Anchor Books Doubleday

Hickling-Hudson, A. & Ahlquist, R. (2003). Contesting the curriculum in the schooling of Indigenous children in the Australian and the United States: From Eurocentrism to culturally powerful pedagogies. *Comparative Education Review, 47*(1), 64-89. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/stable/10.1086/3458377

Hohnen, M. & Pittman, P. (2011). *Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are collaborators*. Retrieved from http://www.dumbofeather.com/conversation/michael-hohnen-and-gurrumul-are-collaborators/

hooks, b. (1992). bell hooks speaking about Paulo Freire—the man, his work. In McLaren, P., & Leonard, P. (Eds.) *Paulo Freire, a critical encounter*. [EBL version]. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com

Inglis, F. & Aers, L. (2008). Pedagogy. *Key Concepts in Education*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/10.4135/9781446211922.n68

Kress, T. & Winchell, M. (2013). Living within the tensions: Freire's Praxis in a high-stakes world R. Lake & T. Kress (Eds.), *Paulo Freire's intellectual roots* (pp. 149-164). New York/London: Bloomsbury Publishing

Jackson, A. Y. (2013). Post humanist data analysis of mangling practices. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 741-748. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2013.788762

Jensen, R. (2010). Whiteness. In The *Routledge Companion to Race and Ethnicity*. Retrieved from http://reader.eblib.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/(S(l5asncntvofkdzczrmm2k45l))/Reader.aspx?p=667793&o=96&u=jOe6MBUcnfOP3bXP7OzZSA%3d%3d&t=1430013873&h=2DF87BFDD0B1A9F3EC964123C449B11AD95AEEA7&s=18721265&ut=245&pg=1&r=img&c=-1&pat=n&cms=-1&sd=1#

John-Steiner, V. (2011). Collaboration. *Encyclopedia of creativity: Two volume set.* Retrieved from *http://reader.eblib.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/(S(34jhwja11rmpvpgniteejvzo))/Reader.aspx?p=710676&o=96&u=jOe6MBUcnfOP3bXP7OzZSA%3d%3d&t=1429967440&h=94A5815C041628056922AAD4D63C9D8C72D97C70&s=18714864&ut=245&pg=1&r=img&c=-1&pat=n&cms=-1&sd=1*

Kaplan, M. (2013). Postcolonial. In *Theory in social and cultural anthropology: An Encyclopedia* Retrieved from http://reader.eblib.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/(S(lfowqpldtm0pp0ub335q5icl))/Reader.aspx?p=1652027&o=96&u=jOe6MBUcnfOP3bXP7OzZSA%3d%3d&t=1430216491&h=F753C80E316D0963FB4EFF3F1C6D6C4FAF3C6DE0&s=18839725&ut=245&pg=635&r=img&c=-1&pat=n&cms=-1&sd=1

Kalscheuer, B. (2008). Encounters in the third space: links between intercultural communication theories and postcolonial approaches. In Ikas, K & Wagner, G (Eds.). *Communicating in the Third Space.* [EBL version]. Retrieved from http://www.eblib.com

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and context.* Canada: University of Toronto Press

Lather, P. (2013). Methodlogy-21: What do we do in the afterward? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 634-645. doi:10.1080/09518398.2013.788753

Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. (2013). Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 629-633. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2013.788752

Leonardo, Z., & Allen, R.L. (2008). Ideology. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods.* doi: http://dx.doi.org.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/10.4135/9781412963909.n207

Arneson, P. (2009). Ontology. In S. Littlejohn, & K. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory.* (pp. 696-699). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/10.4135/9781412959384.n264

Arneson, P. (2009). Epistemology. In S. Littlejohn, & K. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory.* (pp. 350-353). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/10.4135/9781412959384.n131

Lowe, K. (2011). Indigenous education and Aboriginal community partnerships. In N. Purdie, G. Milgate & H.R. Bell (Eds.), *Two way teaching and learning, toward culturally reflective and relevant education* (pp. 13-29). Camberwell, Victoria: ACER Press

Mansell, M. (2003). Citizenship, assimilation and a treaty. In *Treaty: Let's get it right!* (pp. 5-17). Canberra, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press

Martin, K. (2008). *Please knock before you enter—Aboriginal regulations for outsiders and the implications for researchers.* Teneriffe, Australia: Post Pressed

Martin, A, D. & Kamberelis, G. (2013). Mapping not tracing: qualitative educational research with political teeth. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education. 26*(6), 668-679. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788756

Mazzei, L.A. (2014). Beyond an easy sense: A diffractive analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 742-746. doi: 10.1177/1077800414530257

McConaghy, C. (2000). *Rethinking Indigenous education: culturalism, colonialism and the politics of knowing*. Sippy Downs: Post Pressed

McGloin, C. (2009). Considering the work of Martin Nakata's cultural interface a reflection on theory and practice by a non-Indigenous academic. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education. 38*, 36-41. Retrieved from http://search.informit.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/fullText;res=AEIPT;dn=181069

Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the savages, savaging the disciplines*. Canberra, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press

Osborne, S. (2013). Learning Vs education: Rethinking learning in Anangu schools. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 42* (2), 171-181. doi: 10.1017/jie.2013.24

Peard, A. (2013). *On writing: Patrick Pittman*. Retrieved from http://aussietheatre.com.au/features/on-writing-patrick-pittman

Peris, N. (2015, February 12). [video file]. Nova Peris says MPs walking out of debate shows 'total disrespect' for Indigenous people. *The Guardian,* Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/video/2015/feb/12/nova-peris-indigenous-services-nigel-scullion-parliament-speech-video

Phillips, J. (2012). Exploring the possibilities. In Phillips, J. & Lampert, J (Eds), *Introductory Indigenous studies in Education*. (pp. 1-7). NSW: Persons Prentice Hall

Probyn, F. (2004). Playing chicken at the intersection: the white critic of whiteness. *Borderlands e-journal*, *3*(2).

Reynolds, H. (1999). *Why Weren't We Told?—A Personal search for the truth about our history.* Ringwood: Penguin Books.

http://www.australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/reconciliation para 1 2013 Reconciliation

Ryoo, J.J. & McLaren, P. (2010). Critical Theory. *International Encyclopedia of Education (3rd Ed.).* doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01388-9

Sarra, C. (2011). Indigenous education and Aboriginal community partnerships. In N. Purdie, G. Milgate & H.R. Bell (Eds.), *Two way teaching and learning, toward culturally reflective and relevant education* (pp. 107-117). Camberwell, Victoria: ACER Press

Sarra, C. (2015, February 12). Aboriginal people are exceptional. When we can all acknowledge that, the gap will close. *The Guardian*, Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/feb/12/aboriginal-people-are-exceptional-when-we-can-all-acknowledge-that-the-gap-will-close

Selby, J. (2004). Working divides between Indigenous and non-Indigenous: disruptions of identity. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(1), 143 -156. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000150284

Shi-Xu. (2001). Critical pedagogy and communication: creating discourses of diversity, equality, common goals and rational-moral motivation. *Journal of International Studies, 22*(3), 279-293. doi: 10.1080/07256860120094000

Somerville, M. & Perkins, T. (2003). Border work in the contact zone: thinking Indigenous/Non-Indigenous collaboration spatially. *Journal Intercultural Studies, 24*(3), 253-266. doi: 10.1080/0725686032000172597

Stanton, C.R. (2014). Crossing methodological borders: decolonising community-based participatory research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(5), 573-583. doi: 10.1177/1077800413505541

St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). The appearance of data. *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies. 13*(4), 223-227. doi: 10.1177/1532708613487862

St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). The posts continue: becoming. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 646-657. doi:10.1080/09518398.2013.788754

Styres, S., Zinga, D., Bennett, S. & Bomberry, M. (2010). Walking in two worlds: engaging the space between Indigenous community and academia. *Journal of Education, 33*(3), 617-648. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/848717278?accountid=13380

Sutton, P. (2009). *The Politics of Suffering: Indigenous Australia and the end of the liberal consensus.* Melbourne: University Press

Youngblood-Henderson, J (2000). The context of the state of nature. In M. Battiste (Ed.) *Reclaiming Indigenous voices and vision* (pp. 11-37). Vancouver: UBC Press

Trudgen, R. (2000). *Why warriors lie down and die.* Adelaide: Aboriginal Resource and Development Services Inc.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonising Methodologies: research and Indigenous peoples.* Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press

Wallace, R (2011). Power, practice and critical pedagogy for non-Indigenous allies. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 31*(2), 155-172. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1020130157?accountid=13380

Wilson, S. (2003). Progressing toward an Indigenous research paradigm in Canada and Australia. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 27*(2) 161- 178. Retrieved from http://gateway.library.qut.edu.au/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/docview/230305890?accountid=13380

Worby, G ,. Rigney, L.I. & Ulalka Tur, S. (2011). Where salt and fresh waters meet: reconciliation and change in education. *Australian Cultural History, 28*(2-3), 201-224. doi: 10.1080/07288433.2010.582236

About dumbo feather. Retrieved from http://www.dumbofeather.com/about-dumbo-feather/ http://www.dumbofeather.com/

Appendix A: Reflective output One "Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects" (2007)

Personal Reflections on Whiteness and Three Film Projects

by Rolf de Heer

Appendix B: Reflective output Two “Michael Hohnen and Gurrumul are Collaborators”

"Slow down everyone, soak this up."

- Interviewer

  PATRICK PITTMAN

- Interview Date

  THIRD QUARTER 2011

- Location

  MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA

- Weather

  MUCH COLDER THAN DARWIN

Paragraph 1

PATRICK PITTMAN: I’m standing in a ballroom, armed with questions and uncertainty. All over the city, and on the cover of the Rolling Stone, I’ve seen Geoffrey Gurrumul Yunupingu’s face. On the week of the release of his second album, Rrakala, they’ve been calling him Australia’s most important voice. This Yolngu man, born blind on Elcho Island, off the north coast of Arnhem Land, has been selling his songs by the hundreds of thousands in Australia and across Europe. He’s been praised by Sting, by Elton John, and by every major media outlet in the country. His outlook is full of stars, in groups of four, four and a half, and five.

Paragraph 2

PATRICK PITTMAN: But Gurrumul doesn’t care about that. He hates photo shoots, he rarely does them, and he never, ever does interviews. Back in the days of Yothu Yindi, the Yolngu people’s last great crossover, he toured the world, but he’d stayed in the background. I’d been told that this is how it is, and that his collaborator, Michael Hohnen, would speak for him. Michael is a long-time muso (formerly of the Killjoys)

and one of the men behind Skinnyfish Music, Gurrumul's Darwin-based label. Now, he finds himself in the role of Gurrumul's chief collaborator and communicator, and I find myself a little unsure of how to tell this story.

Paragraph 3

PATRICK PITTMAN: Gurrumul is sitting in the window of the ballroom, finger-picking contentedly on his Martin steel string. Cory, our photographer, is talking the blues with him. He smiles, happy to keep playing. The room goes quiet. It's just him and his guitar in this cavernous space. His drummer, leaning against the wall, begins to air drum, mouthing soft brushes. Michael walks to the wall, picking up his double bass. He slides up alongside Gurrumul, and begins to pluck. As the guitar and the air drums and the bass cohere into a jam, I get it. I feel it. Collaboration, the kind that connects people several layers deep. I am transfixed.

Paragraph 4

Gurrumul's not much interested in hanging around for the interview, though he wraps his arm around Michael and laughingly declares them to be "brothers in arms". I'm okay with that, because there's another story here, that of the man who would speak for "Australia's most important voice". As I watch the two of them converse in a mix of Gumatj and English, I decide that I'm not going to ask Michael to speak for Gurrumul, but to speak for himself, and for the relationship the two of them have built over the past fifteen years.

Paragraph 5

PATRICK PITTMAN: Michael, what drew you from Melbourne to Darwin, to Elcho, to Gurrumul, to here?

MICHAEL HOHNEN:
I grew up in Beaumaris, which is a great suburb to grow up in, right next to the beach. I got the best of all worlds. An amazing family, an amazing support network, a great education, and then somehow fluked to get into Melbourne High, which is seen as an elitist high school.

After that, I went around Europe with a string orchestra at 18. I was one of the youngest members. I saw Italy and France and the UK, and then went to the Victorian College of the Arts for three or four years, studied double bass. I came out at 22 or 23, really happy and really solid. So then, after doing music for three of four years, in and around here and overseas with lots of different groups, classical, jazz, and a pop band, the Killjoys, I started to get really disillusioned—is that everything that you do as a musician? Do you just keep doing that same thing?

Paragraph 6

I'm not sure if I met Gurrumul, but I met quite a few of the Yothu Yindi guys when we were signed to Mushroom at the same time. I met Archie Roach in London, and I started to feel like there was something else going on that I just needed to pursue. That's when I went to Darwin, and my whole world changed. By 27 or 28, I had everything that I needed in life, so I wanted to do that same thing in a different way, maybe through music. I suppose I was too young to have that same model that a lot of people have now about the big picture, pouring energy back into a situation for good, or for change, but I think that's sort of what I was doing.

Paragraph 7

The texts that we'd studied back at school, the texts that were studied Australia-wide were written by the teachers that were teaching us, but they were all post-colonial stuff, from the 1800s on.

Paragraph 8

PATRICK PITTMAN: It's like this big void in Australian history. Partly because it's oral history, but partly because there's this huge gap of knowledge and understanding about what else there is here now, not just what else there was.

Paragraph 9

PATRICK PITTMAN: That was an interesting thing about the Sydney Morning Herald review of Gurrumul's new album. It was a really positive review, but he talked at the end of that culture being a lost thing from 200 years ago that the album was calling back to. I got the sense that he thought there was nothing in that space since then, which to me is quite problematic. If we take that statement at face value, there's history missed, and culture that we are missing.

I wonder about that. I wonder whether he's being heavy-handed because you need to in the press sometimes, to get past everything else, or whether it was more flippant. Or whether he hadn't been really struck by anything in his music-reviewing career, because he's an older man now, he's reviewed music for forty years. If you think back over the last fifty years, there's been Jimmy Little, who's essentially done covers, there's some other well-known Aboriginal musicians and artists, then there's the Yothu Yindi era, but it's all kind of, in a way, they're looking at playing a blend of western music and trying to fit in. That's what I feel, everyone's holding the carrot, saying "if you fit in to this industry, then you'll be successful."

Paragraph 10

PATRICK PITTMAN: The questions I had written down, the first ones I wanted to ask were about defining the nature of the creative relationship between yourself and Gurrumul. Then I see the two of you in the room, and I get it. You don't need words to explain that. But how did you find it?

I think he was sick of touring when he left Yothu Yindi and he was hanging out on (Elcho) Island. He doesn't have an agenda, he doesn't go "I'm going to do this now" and be driven to do something. He was just hanging out having fun with family, and I turned up there running a music industry course. Some of his peers came along to this music course and had fun on the first day. So the second day, or even that night, dragged him along. I was the junior, because there were two of us there from the uni, and the guitarist from Yothu Yindi was there, so Gurrumul felt comfortable straight away because he knew him. But then he hung around afterwards after everyone else had gone, to see what would happen. He said, "let's do some four track stuff ", back then you recorded on cassette four track when you were doing demos, and we recorded "Djarrimirri", which is off the first album. I went home after two days, and thought "I've turned up on this island to try to run a music course, and we've got this musical gift here, who is completely capable of doing anything".

Paragraph 11

It was a Certificate One course, such a low level course, and I wondered what else we could do. How do we make use of the fact that we're here, for quite a long time, for a couple of months? I tried to shape the whole course around how gifted and talented everyone was, and what they could actually do with that. I talked a lot about forming a group, and they really wanted to do that, and Gurrumul wanted to be part of it. That ended up becoming his band, which he's done ever since, called Saltwater.

Paragraph 12

I'd talked to them a lot about what they'd have to do to actually be a band, beyond what a lot of the other groups do up in the north, which is just get together and play at a little community thing. They were so talented, but so naive about anything to do with the music industry. In a way the course made perfect sense, because I had to teach them about how the rest of the world works music industry-wise. I said when I left that, essentially, you guys have to actually work for two years without anyone doing much. Sure enough, I left them and two years later, they'd kept on going, had all these great songs, they'd recorded an album.

Paragraph 13

PATRICK PITTMAN: In a musical sense, is it an expression of what's going on at Elcho Island, or is he bringing in other things as well?

Well, it's his form of contemporary Aboriginal culture. He has a lot of musical influences. He'll sing traditional music, he'll play didjeridu, the Yolngu word for it is yirdaki. He knows hundreds and hundreds of songs, but he doesn't see that as his role, presenting that to mainstream Australia.

Paragraph 14

If people delve into him in deeper layers, and delve into what he's singing about, I think that's when you present the more complex elements of his world. It's so deep and multi-layered, it's fantastic. That first album was me saying "here's a tiny bit of him", but I know that people here and overseas don't want to get too much of the whole traditional Aboriginal style, because they don't understand it, it's different tuning systems and they just turn off, but here's a little bit and see how amazing it is, how beautiful it is. That was the modus operandi. He's very comfortable when he presents this music, as you saw in there jamming, playing those chords and those styles.

Paragraph 15

PATRICK PITTMAN: When did it develop into a creative collaborative relationship for the two of you? Is that something that happened pretty quickly?

No. Part of the way the label runs is to try to present music that those guys do, as they want to do it. I've let his own band do the music. But about four years ago, I saw that he wasn't actually getting out to the world, like in Yothu Yindi, he was part of the mass of noise that's coming out of the speakers. It sounds great, and it's really exciting, but I just knew that he's too special, and he needed to do something more, if I could get him to do something more. The collaborative part of it, that you ask about, started about four years ago when I started to say "I want to just hear you, I don't want to hear everyone else that's filling in the gaps and playing those synthesised keyboards behind you."

Paragraph 16

He was fine about it, we mucked around, and did some things just like that, but when he started hearing my double bass with his guitar, and how I would just play with him and muck around and fill in things, he was laughing, and he was so happy. That's when we recorded a few little ideas, and did a couple of support gigs for other people in Darwin, and he felt like it made sense. That's when our collaborative relationship really, really took off.

Paragraph 15

PATRICK PITTMAN: There must be tension for you, in that you want it to be about Gurrumul's expression, as with all of the stuff you do with the label, but at the same time, you're the one there as the industry guy, saying "you're going to have to make

a career out of it, you have to do this, you have to do that". Have you found a way of reconciling that?

Paragraph 16

The industry success lets us keep going with what we want do as a label. The more stuff that we do, a lot of it is fun, there's a lot of waiting around and terrible things, but a lot of it is fun, so it's a real achievement. I get to meet lots of people like you, I have fantastic conversations, and we're not doing something that is a manufactured product, so you can go in a hundred different directions with how you want to talk about it, what the possibilities are, and who loves it.

Paragraph 17

I had this great meeting in London, we got invited to go and have a drink with the guy who manages Norah Jones, Elvis Costello, three or four amazing artists. He'd been in touch with us, and he came to see us and talk about Gurrumul. He said

"there are artists that are derivative, and there are artists that just have their own space."

Paragraph 18

He said it was just so refreshing to work with that, to see that. Part of my role in the industry is to meet all of these amazing people and talk about music, which is something that I love, but also to talk about what I think as a white person growing up in Australia, what I think can happen here.

Paragraph 19

He's very non-political and never wants to make any comments, and doesn't really have any interest in anything political. I don't really, either. But I know the joy and interest I've got from growing up in Australia, knowing what Australia is, and then discovering another part that is right in front of us, and is so fascinating.

Paragraph 20

But he really doesn't want to do any of that sort of stuff. He's resigned to the fact that there's a little bit that he has to do. He doesn't really want to do this shoot today, but he trusts me so much that we don't do very many. A tiny bit is fine, when we're on a little trip anyway…

Paragraph 21

PATRICK PITTMAN: But that's always kept at a distance from home.
Yeah, and the only shoot he really jumped at doing was the Rolling Stone shoot.

Paragraph 22

PATRICK PITTMAN: And who wouldn't?

That's the only magazine he knows, because of Dr Hook, and because of that song, "Cover of the Rolling Stone". And so that, he must have asked back when he knew that song, and found out that it was a magazine. I talk to him about lots of magazines, he doesn't know any of them, doesn't know any newspapers, it's all irrelevant. There's that balance, and all the guys that come on tour with me, they love it, they think it's fantastic. But I can see why he's not into it, as well as why he says yes occasionally to it all.

Paragraph 23

Where he lives and who he hangs out with back home, it's quite rough, and people are humbugging him, hassling him all the time. But Yolngu people, they live with each other, it's 20 or 30 people around you all the time, you're all sharing things all the time so if you've got more, you give it to them, so he's being hassled by family as well as celebrated by family at the same time.

Paragraph 24

PATRICK PITTMAN: Has the success changed much for people on Elcho Island?

Yeah, a little bit. Not nearly as much as I thought it would. I thought there could be some really ugly aspects of success. It's a totally different society and different way of dealing with money. Material things are irrelevant. People love having somewhere to stay, and all that kind of thing, but you see government schemes of building this and building that and pouring hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars into projects that just fall over. Him having had more success and having more money, the only thing that changes is that he shares it out a bit more, and it leaks out through the community. It might go to fifty people, within two days. There's no big impact, big spending, big pressure points, there's nothing material that you see changing. He's got a close-knit family of maybe 30 or 40, and an extended family of hundreds. Occasionally he'll change his phone number, but he can deal with things really well. He's quite public, quite accessible; a lot of his family are in all the time, extended family, wanting to do this or that. He's good at saying no, and we keep in close contact with the family. My partner in the record label lives on the island a lot of the time, his mum and dad are still alive, his mum is in this booklet, painting him up, and that will mean a lot to her. It's respect back to the family that we're saying that even at his highest point in his career, this is him with you.

Paragraph 25

PATRICK PITTMAN: You moved up to Darwin straight from Melbourne. It's a place very much unlike anywhere else in Australia—it changes a person, up there.

It's quite confronting. White people tried to settle there many times. It's hard living. Gurrumul loves it—wherever we are, he wants 32 or 33 degrees. Hotels, recording studios, anywhere. It's a strange place because it's supposedly tropical, but once you've acclimatised, the humidity is almost comforting, it surrounds you all the time. It almost supports you all the time, but you can't be a labourer and enjoy the humidity, it's too full on.

Paragraph 26

PATRICK PITTMAN: But a muso can! You talk about there being an absence of politics in what Gurrumul's doing, that it's stridently non- political, he's just telling stories, but there is a politics there that almost comes naturally. The songs are full of loss and longing, to preserve things that may pass, to be slow and to consider, but what interested me is that it's not sad.

Great! Because it's been reviewed as sad three or four times.

Paragraph 27

PATRICK PITTMAN: It's not. You can have longing without sadness.

You're right!

Paragraph 28

PATRICK PITTMAN: It's a really interesting way of telling those stories.

What I think you're getting at is what he presents to people, and partly what my role was and the engineer's role, was to present that same mood in the sound that we've created. There's a song called "Warwu", that translates as grieving or worrying. But it's actually not worrying, it's to do with longing, and reminding yourself that you are part of that connection with the land, the spirits, you are totally connected to that place and you are not going to lose it. It's not even a longing. It's the same feeling you get when you're nostalgic about something. You get really happy, and you get melancholy. It's about being in touch. I want to say with nature, but it sounds like I'm being too new age. But so much of him is to be in touch with what those ancestors were all about, and what the songs were all about, and that is the tides, the wind, the funeral song, going back into the ground, into the termite mound, being at one again with the earth, the land. Saying this to you now sounds like so many things that you read that are really clichéd and corny…

Paragraph 29

PATRICK PITTMAN: But music does, and can, come from somewhere deeper. It can come from the land, it's so deeply connected to these things. It's not just what comes out of the strings. There's a truth that goes deeper than that, and it is tricky to talk about, because it does sound stupid.

I think a lot of people in our society are so wired into technology, and into the regime of their lives, of collecting, amassing some sort of savings and extra properties, getting their children set up. Their agenda is let's go go go, get ourselves comfortable and get on top of things, and then try and get more on top of things so they're really comfortable, and be in touch with what's going on, and read papers and read magazines and read everything that's going on. It's like they lose, in a way, what Gurrumul's singing about, and then when they hear him, it's like "that's what I want." Everyone's got that choice, but not many people make that choice.

Paragraph 30

PATRICK PITTMAN: Is that where the connection is coming from, and why people have connected to him?
I think so.

Paragraph 31

PATRICK PITTMAN: He connected, and continues to connect, in a sense that is astounding. I'm guessing even your most optimistic business plans didn't allow for this kind of success.
Well, luckily we don't make them. I've gone all out to try to make sure that the sound complements that connection. When we did the first album, there were lots of ways you could mix that. There are some beautiful albums that have come out in the last 40 or 50 years that just have a great sound to them as well as what the musicians are doing, and I worked really hard to try and get that as well. So you felt really warm and comfortable when you listen to that first album.

Paragraph 32

A lot of people say that the songs sound all the same. I wanted that mood, I love the idea of an album which is a mood for an hour. It just says "slow down everyone, soak this up". That was complementing what he already does, which I think has really boosted part of that initial reaction to him. It could have been presented and mixed differently and could have sounded a bit flat or pure or straight or something else, but we pushed that warmth factor. On the second one, we've gone a bit different, but the combination of the two is probably the factor that everyone's striving to pinpoint. I've heard a few albums coming out sounding similar, and I'm going "don't worry about trying to sound like this, just do your own thing". Now that someone's done it…

Paragraph 33

PATRICK PITTMAN: It can't be a genuine expression of them. Is it a genuine expression of Gurrumul?
A lot of great songs are people writing about something, and then someone else coming along and singing about what someone else has written about, trying to make

a performance out of that, and trying to make you believe that that's what they're thinking or feeling. John Lennon might be an exception on some of his songs, but most they are third hand, often songs are written for someone else, and someone else makes you believe that it's them. You look at the whole industry and you think this is a bit of a farce in a way, all of these people are writing things that are not actually what they're feeling. They're just performing great songs, and trying to get that connection.

Paragraph 34

But with Gurrumul's music, it's totally him, and it's about him, and he's singing about himself, and he's singing about his identity. He's not acting, he's not performing, he's not doing a show, it's not cabaret. That's the purity, and that's what's exciting—we're not having to go on stage and perform. We go on stage and produce sounds and be musicians.

Paragraph 35

I think sometimes he feels like he needs to perform but he doesn't have the capacity to necessarily perform. He was in Yothu Yindi for seven years, and they were the full performance act, with the smoke and the mirrors.

Paragraph 36

PATRICK PITTMAN: They were very much about the in-your-face show.
And that's great. But what I love about working with Gurrumul is that he's just able to be himself. There's no pressure on him.

Paragraph 37

PATRICK PITTMAN: And he doesn't really care to be any other way.
No.

Paragraph 38

PATRICK PITTMAN: Given the phenomenal level of success…
When you say phenomenal, it is, and three years ago when we were a little label, it is in that perspective, but it's not compared to, say, Norah Jones. It's phenomenal on a small scale.

Paragraph 39

PATRICK PITTMAN: But in an industry where people seem to have stopped buying music, the fact that his is being bought at those levels is something special. What's it meant for Skinnyfish in terms of what you've been able to do outside of Gurrumul's work?
It's meant that we can support other Aboriginal artists. There are another few artists that we are working with, and I'm making another couple of extraordinary albums. It's also given us confidence that we're on the right track, which is a big thing morally

and creatively. Because it's the end of the first week, we don't have any figures on it, but it's sold really well, so it's like

"great, it wasn't a fluke, we know what we're doing."

Paragraph 38

We can trust ourselves a lot more. They're probably the biggest factors for us. It's the confidence building thing. Working in that environment, we have to be really sure of ourselves, and clear that we are doing it for the right reasons, and laying it on a platter to everyone as a business model. Our contracts have to be really public, otherwise you're up for scrutiny, and everyone's really suss on you, like you're ripping off people or something like that.

Paragraph 39

PATRICK PITTMAN: You find yourself in this role as a spokesman for Gurrumul as well as the label man. That must be something that people are suspicious of, the white man doing the talking?

I reckon. I feel it's the only choice I've got. You saw him, he doesn't want to have anything to do with it at all, and won't commit to any answers. Occasionally when he's with me for a few days, I can get a few things out of him. He listens to a lot of things that I say on radio and tells me what he thinks, in private. In some ways I think that I've been brought up like most other people who buy his music, so I've got more of a window into telling them what they're interested in than him coming out with things. He doesn't come out with much to me, and we've hung out together for fifteen years. We don't talk a lot about anything that heavy, it's more of a social and musical relationship. It's a fun relationship, he has his own life and I have my own life and it's really healthy in that way. He never asks loads of questions, and I never delve deeply into his world.

Paragraph 39

PATRICK PITTMAN: And when the two of you are in a room together with your instruments, does all of that just fall away?

It falls away most of the time. Because we know each other so well, we don't have to talk much. I think a lot of people do feel uncomfortable when they don't talk, but he's totally fine with it and I'm totally fine with it, so often we'll spend time where we're not actually saying anything at all, we're just hanging out. He loves humour, if you're keeping it light. There's a lot of heavy things in his life, a lot of death and sickness. I get the feeling that I'm light relief for him in lots of ways. It's great fun going away for a little while, he gets really good experiences and has a really good time, but then dives back into the Yolngu world and swims amongst that.

Paragraph 40

PATRICK PITTMAN: You're the vacation from that.
Yeah, but that's where he lives. His totem is the saltwater crocodile. He's like the crocodile that spends most of its time in the water but sometimes comes out onto the land, to sunbake or whatever. That's a bit like our relationship. He's really comfortable when he's swimming around in the Yolngu world, but he's comfortable when he comes onto land, and that's my time with him.

Paragraph 41

PATRICK PITTMAN: Let's talk about how you guys make an album together. Does he bring songs to you, does he sing to you, do you jam them out? How does it work?
Yeah he does. He'll play something in the hotel, and I'll say it sounds great, so he'll work on it for a while longer. Six or twelve months later, he'll have lyrics for it, and he's checked those lyrics with lots of family members. It makes sense, he doesn't want to present something to the public until he knows and he's been told by not just one person but lots of different people that it makes sense. You should use that ancestor's work, or you can't phrase it like that.

Paragraph 42

PATRICK PITTMAN: So he's actually done a lot of research and fact-checking.
One interesting thing for this album is that I've heard two or three really strong songs by his family. I'll say to him, what about that song by those guys. Now, I need about three or four years—I suggested one song on this album about three years ago, and then last year he played it for me, in a dressing room.

Paragraph 43

PATRICK PITTMAN: He didn't say anything, but we were just sitting there and he played it and sang it to me. That was like saying "oh, Michael, you know that song you asked me to do two or three years ago? Here it is."

Paragraph 44

There was none of that, but he just sat there grinning, because he knows that I thought that would be a great song for this album. Or something that he should do in the future, so it's more me seeding ideas, him going with some and him rejecting some totally.

Paragraph 45

There was another song that we wanted on this record which was a Manduwuy (Yunupingu of Yothu Yindi) song, from their big album, and we talked about it, he suggested it, and we couldn't get in touch with Manduwuy for two or three days while we were in the studio. He wouldn't do it until he'd been given the go-ahead, so we

didn't do it on the album. All the other stuff is either old stuff that he's done before, or new stuff that he's worked up in the last three or four years.

Paragraph 46

Track eleven was on guitar, and we did it in New York, and I came back to Australia and listened to everything that we'd done there and it was great but it wasn't special enough, so I asked him to try it on piano. He did, and it was just beautiful. It was perfect.

Paragraph 47

When we're in the studio working, I'll ask him to try something and he'll do it straight away, he'll try any idea that I ask him to try. He's totally committed, once he's there and he's said to me, just by doing it, okay I'm here now, he'll do anything really. Track two, "what I think we need at the end of that first verse is some uplifting kind of counter melody." And he'll come in with something perfect, "how did you know I was thinking something exactly like that? He knows what I would love, and does it for me, but he also has similar taste in music. For ten minutes afterwards, he'll go "you like it? you like it?". And he'll laugh, because he knows it sounds great. He likes it too, but he doesn't say he likes it, he just keeps checking that I like it.

Paragraph 48

A lot of his life is affirmation—deferring responsibility to other people, and looking for affirmation from other people. I think a lot of that is to do with his blindness. I don't think of him as blind, ever, but that's how he works. It's needing other people to tell him all the time. You watch him at a gig, he'll check where the microphone is dozens and dozens of times during a gig, he's always checking, just to see that it's in the same place, and that's how he works in life, he's always just checking that something's still there, something hasn't changed, that you still think the same. He really needs and thrives off that support and affirmation.

Paragraph 49

PATRICK PITTMAN: And I see him with his arm around you, declaring the two of you brothers in arms.

He loves that. He adopted me. There's a beautiful kinship system that works in the Yolngu society. You are born with an identity. You and I are born with a bit of an identity, but he knows so much about who he is as soon as he's born. He's born into the society of Yolngu, and everybody has to fit, which is why they adopt you in. You're their uncle or their brother or their father or their grandfather or you're their cousin or poison cousin. You have to fit in somehow. The kinship society works so well—there are sixteen different skin names, you are one of those sixteen, and that's who you are for life. It's really strong and well organised. But that's only in the north-east Arnhem Land area —you go to the Tiwi Islands and they want nothing to do with that.

Paragraph 50

PATRICK PITTMAN: You must have to work across many different cultures for the label.

We do. The Tiwis are much more embracing of new things that come along, the Yolngu are more traditional. In Kakadu, near there there's the Mara people, the Gunwinggu, then you go to Maningrida, there are three different groups there. All through Arnhem Land, it's like a miniature Europe. Think about how differently the French and the Germans think of their own cultures, language and everything is structured so differently, and it's the same. At one stage, there were hundreds of different countries. I think we all know that much more now. There were similarities, but if you go west of Darwin, it's quite different again.

Paragraph 51

When you go to Japan, or anywhere else, you pick up that you have to change the way you act in those countries. Unless you're a bogan and you go to Bali and decide that you're going to go to parties all day and you don't actually go and meet Balinese people and deal with them. It's the same when you go to Aboriginal Australia, it's a totally different world.

Paragraph 52

One of the most amazing experiences I ever had was being taken by George, who's Gurrumul's poison cousin, to the islands north of Elcho on a hunting trip, with three other older guys who were all amazing hunters. He's a Gumatj man as well, who used to be the lead singer of the Warumpi Band. They didn't speak any English for the whole trip, occasionally they would try and tell me something, but they were just focussed on what they were doing, which was turtle hunting, going to an island, finding spring water, the whole day and night was a completely other experience, in Australia. I don't know how we navigated home, I really don't. I couldn't see any stars. There were clouds in the sky, there were no lights anywhere, we had no lights, we drove for two hours, past four islands, down their island, with no light at all, and got back safely at ten or eleven at night. I experienced one day that I don't think many people are going to experience. It was total intuition.

Paragraph 53

When we're working with Gurrumul, we have to go with him, we have to be with him and try and make it work for him. Aboriginal people don't live a long time, and while it's so good for him and us and his family, we just have to go with that. We've got no choice, because he won't go any other way, but a lot of people are quite tight and rigid and can't change the way they're structured and their business, or their family life, or anything, to go in that direction. I think that probably helps us achieve what we're doing.

- See more at: http://www.dumbofeather.com/conversation/michael-hohnen-and-gurrumul-are-collaborators/#sthash.pORIwG8p.dpuf